DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 105 SO 020 011

AUTHOR	Brophy, Jere
TITLE	Teaching for Conceptual Understanding and Higher Order Applications of Social Studies Content. Elementary Subjects Center, Series No. 3.
INSTITUTION	Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Inst. for Research on Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Dec 88
CONTRACT	G0098C0226
NOTE	111p.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Citizenship Education; Cognitive Style; Comprehension; *Concept Formation; Content Analysis; Curriculum; Curriculum Research; Educational History; *Educational Trends; Elementary Education; Literature Reviews; *Problem Solving; *Social Studies; State of the Art Reviews
IDENTIFIERS	*Higher Order Learning; *Higher Order Skills; National Council for the Social Studies

ABSTRACT

One of seven review/synthesis papers prepared to help frame the research program of the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, this paper describes historical developments and current issues in curriculum, instruction, and evaluation in elementary social studies, with emphasis on teaching for understanding and higher order applications of the content. Leading scholars and organizations concerned with elementary level social education have developed statements on teaching for understanding and for higher order thinking and problem solving in the social studies. It is concluded that (1) the higher order goals of instruction in social studies are comparable to those of instruction in other subjects, at least if they are described in a few basic terms (such as conceptual understanding, critical thinking, and inquiry) rather than decomposed into long lists of partial skills, but (2) values, dispositions, and appreciation and self-actualization goals need to be considered along with more conventionally described knowledge and skills goals. The emphasis on citizen education as the transcendent purpose of social studies means that the higher order goals of social studies curricula focus more on personal and civic decision making than on the knowledge generation and problem-solving paradigms pursued in the social sciences and also that there is a strong emphasis on the values and dispositions involved in preparing students to become active participants in a democratic society. (Author/PPB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

2/2-89 b 50

ED309105

SO020011

Elementary Subjects Center
Series No. 3

TEACHING FOR CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING AND HIGHER ORDER APPLICATIONS OF SOCIAL STUDIES CONTENT

Jere Brophy

Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects

Institute for Research on Teaching

College of Education

Michigan State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
JERE BROPHY
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MSU is an affirmative action/equal opportunity institution

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Elementary Subjects Center
Series No. 3

TEACHING FOR CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING AND HIGHER ORDER APPLICATIONS OF SOCIAL STUDIES CONTENT

Jere Brophy

Published by

The Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects
Institute for Research on Teaching
252 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034

December 1988

This work is sponsored in part by the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University. The Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects is funded primarily by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the Office or Department (Cooperative Agreement No. G0098C0226).

Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects

The **Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects** was awarded to Michigan State University in 1987 after a nationwide competition. Funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, the Elementary Subjects Center is a major project housed in the Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT). The program focuses on conceptual understanding, higher order thinking, and problem solving in elementary school teaching of mathematics, science, social studies, literature, and the arts. Center researchers are identifying exemplary curriculum, instruction, and evaluation practices in the teaching of these school subjects; studying these practices to build new hypotheses about how the effectiveness of elementary schools can be improved; testing these hypotheses through school-based research; and making specific recommendations for the improvement of school policies, instructional materials, assessment procedures, and teaching practices. Research questions include, What content should be taught when teaching for conceptual understanding and higher level learning? How do teachers concentrate their teaching to use their limited resources best? and In what ways is good teaching subject matter-specific?

The work is designed to unfold in three phases, beginning with literature review and interview studies designed to elicit and synthesize the points of view of various stakeholders (representatives of the underlying academic disciplines, intellectual leaders and organizations concerned with curriculum and instruction in school subjects, classroom teachers, state- and district-level policymakers) concerning ideal curriculum, instruction, and evaluation practices in these five content areas at the elementary level. Phase II involves interview and observation methods designed to describe current practice, and in particular, best practice as observed in the classrooms of teachers believed to be outstanding. Phase II also involves analysis of curricula (both widely used curriculum series and distinctive curricula developed with special emphasis on conceptual understanding and higher order applications), as another approach to gathering information about current practices. In Phase III, test models of ideal practice will be developed based on what has been learned and synthesized from the first two phases.

The findings of Center research are published by the IRT in the Elementary Subjects Center Series. Information about the Center is included in the *IRT Communication Quarterly* (a newsletter for practitioners) and in lists and catalogs of IRT publications. For more information, to receive a list or catalog, or to be placed on the IRT mailing list to receive the newsletter, please write to the Editor, Institute for Research on Teaching, 252 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034.

Co-directors: Jere E. Brophy and Penelope L. Peterson

Senior Consultant: Andrew C. Porter

Senior Researchers: Patricia Cianciolo, Donald Freeman, Magdalene Lampert, Wanda May, Richard Prawat, Ralph Putnam, Cheryl Rosaen, Kathleen Roth

Editor: Sandra Gross

Editorial Assistant: Diane Smith

Abstract

One of seven review/synthesis papers prepared to help frame the research program of the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, this paper describes historical developments and current issues in curriculum, instruction, and evaluation in elementary social studies, with emphasis on teaching for understanding and higher order applications of the content. It is concluded that (a) the higher order goals of instruction in social studies are comparable to those of instruction in other subjects, at least if they are described in a few molar terms (such as conceptual understanding, critical thinking, inquiry, problem solving, decision making, and empowering students with accessible and usable knowledge) rather than decomposed into long lists of molecular part skills; but (b) values, dispositions, and appreciation and self-actualization goals need to be considered along with more conventionally described knowledge and skills goals.

TEACHING FOR CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING AND HIGHER ORDER APPLICATIONS OF SOCIAL STUDIES CONTENT

Jere Brophy[1]

This is one of a set of seven reports being prepared for Study 1 of Phase I of the research agenda of the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects. Phase I of our work calls for surveying and synthesizing the opinions of various categories of experts concerning the nature of elementary-level instruction in mathematics, science, social studies, literature, and the arts, with particular attention to how teaching for understanding and for higher order thinking and problem solving should be handled within such instruction. Study 1 of Phase I calls for review of the literature in educational psychology, cognitive science, and related fields on teaching for understanding and for higher order thinking and problem solving, as well as the literature on these topics as they are discussed by curriculum and instruction experts within the context of teaching particular school subjects. The present paper focuses on statements about teaching for understanding and for higher order thinking and problem solving in the social studies that have been advanced by the leading scholars and organizations concerned with elementary-level social education.

Citizen Education as the Transcendent Purpose

Analysis of alternative views on higher order thinking and problem solving in the social studies begins with recognition that the vast majority of social studies educators, regardless of how much they may differ on issues of content emphasis and instructional methods, agree that the primary purpose of the social studies, especially at the elementary level, is citizen education. As phrased in the curriculum guidelines released by the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), "the basic goal of social studies education is to prepare young people to be humane, rational, participating citizens in a world that is becoming increasingly interdependent" (NCSS, 1979, p. 262). The guidelines go on to differentiate the social studies from the social sciences, noting that the efforts of social scientists who develop understandings of human behavior through research are not necessarily related to persistent human problems addressed in the social studies or intended to arrive at resolutions of value conflicts or public policy debates. Thus, although the social studies are informed by the disciplines of history and the social sciences, decisions about curriculum and instruction in the social studies will be guided more by beliefs about the needs of the students and of society than by current formulations of knowledge within these disciplines. The social studies are cross-disciplinary in their organization of content and they include content drawn from the arts and humanities, current events, an[illegible]alue and policy debates in addition to content drawn from history and the social sciences.

---

[1] Jere Brophy is co-director of the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects. The author wishes to acknowledge and thank Cleo Cherryholmes, Tom Good, Carole Hahn, Penelope Peterson, Andrew Porter, Richard Prawat, Ralph Putnam, Diane Ravitch, Cheryl Rosaen, Kathleen Roth, Tom Shuell, and Stephen Thornton for their comments on earlier versions of this paper, and June Smith for her assistance in manuscript preparation.

The emphasis on citizen education as the transcendent purpose of social studies means that the higher order goals of social studies curricula focus more on personal and civic decision making than on the knowledge generation and problem-solving paradigms pursued in the social sciences and also that there is a strong emphasis on the values and dispositions involved in preparing students to become active participants in a democratic society in addition to the emphasis on development of knowledge and skills that typifies the teaching of all school subjects.

Elaborating on the rationale for this purpose statement and its implications, social studies educators (following Engle, 1960) typically advance a version of the following argument: (a) If they are to maintain their viability, democratic societies such as our own must develop citizens who are both prepared and willing to accept the responsibilities that accompany citizenship in such societies; (b) among the major social institutions, the school is the only one created explicitly for this purpose; (c) although the entire school curriculum is designed to develop desirable attributes in students, the social studies focus in particular on preparing students to fulfill their roles as citizens; and (d) given the complexities of the modern world and the fact that societies must adapt to inventions and other changing conditions, schools cannot hope to prepare their students for effective citizen participation by teaching them a limited and fixed set of values, information, and skills--instead, they will have to concentrate on developing their students into well-informed and thoughtful decision makers. Parker and Jarolimek (1984), for example, stress that a successful social studies program will prepare a particular _kind_ of citizen: one who is an _informed_ person _skilled_ in the processes of a free society, who is committed to _democratic values_ and who not only is able to but _feels obligated to participate_ in social, political, and economic processes. Parker and Kaltsounis (1986) add that the thinking and actions of such a citizen would be characterized by the following three perspectives: (a) _global_ (commitment to liberty and justice for all extends to people everywhere), (b) _pluralistic_ (cultural diversity and differences of opinion are seen as acceptable or even desirable), and (c) _constructive or critical_ (democracy is seen as unfinished business, the nation is seen as in need of maintenance and improvement).

Competing Views on How to Accomplish Citizen Education

Even though most social studies educators agree on citizen education as the transcendent purpose of social studies, they disagree in suggesting guidelines about how this purpose can be accomplished. Several authors have developed classifications characterizing these differing points of view. Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1977) identified three main traditions describing contrasting approaches: (a) teaching social studies as citizenship transmission/inculcation of traditional values; (b) teaching social studies as social science, with emphasis on how knowledge is structured within the disciplines and on discovery learning/inquiry activities; and (c) teaching social studies as reflective inquiry, with emphasis on values analysis and decision making.

Classifying on a different basis, Engle and Ochoa (1988) described three broad definitions of social studies that generate a total of seven different approaches to teaching it. The first definition identifies social studies narrowly with the study of history and the social sciences. Subtypes of this definition are (a) social studies as the exposition of the separate social sciences, (b) social studies as indoctrination via selective coverage of history and the social sciences designed to reinforce American views and values, and (c) social studies as the multidisciplinary study of topics (treated in a factual manner rather than from a problems approach). Engle and Ochoa viewed all three of these approaches as leading to lecture/recitation teaching that pushes students to memorize material presented as fact rather than teaching them to see multiple perspectives and raise questions. There are two subtypes to the second definition of social studies as the critical study of the social sciences: (a) social studies as the critical analysis of the social sciences and (b) social studies as the replication of social science scholarship. Both of these approaches involve switching from an expository to a hypothetical mode of teaching and treating social science truth claims as hypotheses for study and validation rather than as factual knowledge. The third definition of social studies as the examination of social problems also contains two subtypes: (a) social studies as the study of persistent social issues (featuring discussion and debate on enduring dilemmas involving justice, fairness, and competing values) and (b) social studies as the direct study of significant social problems (in which students do direct research on real and current social problems).

Brubaker, Simon, and Williams (1977) identified five major approaches to social studies education: (a) social studies as knowledge of the past as a guide to good citizenship (emphasis on history), (b) social studies in the student-centered tradition, (c) social studies as reflective inquiry; (d) social studies as social science, and (e) social studies as sociopolitical involvement.

Martorella (1985) also identified five major approaches to social studies education and argued that both the evolution of the field over time and the differences in current curricula can be understood in terms of differences in relative emphasis on these five approaches: (a) social studies taught as _transmission of the cultural heritage_ (transmit traditional knowledge and values as a framework for making decisions); (b) social studies taught as _social science_ (master social science concepts, generalizations, and processes to build a knowledge base for later learning); (c) social studies taught as _reflective inquiry_ (use a process of thinking and learning in which knowledge is derived from what citizens need to know to make decisions and solve problems); (d) social studies taught as _informed social criticism_ (provide opportunities for examination, critique, and revision of past traditions, existing social practices, and modes of problem solving); and (e) social studies taught as _personal development_ (develop a positive self-concept, a strong sense of personal efficacy, and an understanding of one's relationships with others).

The similarities in these lists illustrate that the diversity in social studies curricula should not be interpreted as resulting from underlying chaos or lack of conceptualization of the goals and methods of social education, but instead as resulting from competition among clear and well-understood alternative conceptualizations. Martorella's list reflects the fact that social studies education in recent years has been affected by the views of revisionist historians and scholars concerned with the politics of knowledge (leading to the social criticism approach) and by modifications in the traditional dominance of the curriculum by history, geography, economics, and political science to include content drawn from psychology, sociology, and anthropology (leading to the personal development approach).

Most current social studies programs integrate elements of all five of these approaches, although in differing proportions. Programs for the elementary grades tend to emphasize personal development, knowledge of the contemporary world, and various basic information gathering, critical thinking, and decision making skills, all taught in interdisciplinary social studies courses. Compared to what occurs at the secondary level, there is relatively less emphasis on history, on teaching the social studies as social science disciplines, or on social criticism.

Evolution of the Social Studies Curriculum

Competing views on the purposes and goals of social education have waxed and waned over time. The following summary of the evolution of the elementary social studies curriculum in the United States is intended to provide a context within which to consider contemporary views on higher order thinking in social studies classes.

Kliebard (1987) has characterized the history of the school curriculum as it has developed in the United States over the last century (in all school subjects, not just social studies) as a continuing struggle among supporters of four competing ideas about what should be the primary basis for the design of K-12 curriculum and instruction. In Kliebard's analysis, these four different points of view wax and wane in relative influence and often reappear with new names and seemingly new rationales, but their core ideas remain basically the same. The first viewpoint emphasizes the academic disciplines, looking to them not only as storehouses of important knowledge but as sources of authority concerning what counts as important knowledge, how this knowledge should be organized and taught, and how new knowledge should be developed. This point of view was dominant when the schools were organized and has persisted as a powerful conservative counterweight to reform movements. Reformers typically emphasize the core ideas in one or more of the other three persistent points of view. They consist of (a) those who argue that the natural course of child development should be the basis for the design of school curriculum and instruction, so that the content taught at any particular grade level would be keyed to the interests and learning needs associated with its corresponding ages and stages, (b) those who would work backwards from their perceptions of the qualities associated with ideal fulfillment of the adult roles in society (citizen, worker, etc.) in order to design schooling primarily as a mechanism for preparing children for these adult roles, and (c) those who wish to use the schools as mechanisms for combating social injustice and promoting social change by focusing curriculum and instruction on discussion of social issues. Because social education focuses explicitly on social content, much of the evolution of the social studies curriculum and most of the debates and reform movements that have developed periodically, especially those concerned with secondary education, can be understood within this context provided by Kliebard.

At the elementary level, social studies is more clearly a school subject separate from its underlying academic disciplines, and its development through time is probably better described within a framework supplied by Haas (1979), which elaborates on the three traditions described by Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1977) and places them in historical context. Haas notes that the citizenship transmission position, or the "conservative cultural continuity" approach as he calls it, has been the mainstream approach to social studies instruction, particularly at the elementary level, since social studies was organized as a school subject. Associated with this approach is support for the status quo, emphasis on the development of Western civilization and uncritical celebration of and inculcation in American political traditions and values. Periodically, this dominant approach is challenged by one or the other of two general reform approaches.

The first, which Haas calls "intellectual aspects of history and the social sciences," corresponds to the teaching of social studies as social science as described by Barr, Barth, and Shermis. Calls for reform in this direction typically come from academic historians and social scientists and emphasize the perceived need for more content drawn from the disciplines, more accurate and up-to-date coverage of such content, preservation of the integrity of the separate disciplines (typically in the form of separate courses), organization of curricula around conceptual structures drawn from the disciplines, and, at least in its more recent manifestations, an emphasis on discipline-based inquiry and learning by discovery.

The other major reform position calls for an emphasis on the "process of thinking reflectively," or what Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1977) described as teaching social studies as reflective inquiry. Haas (1979) describes this approach as rooted in Dewey's ideas about reflective thinking and notes that it is associated with discussion of problems and issues that feature forms of higher order thinking such as critical thinking, decision making, problem solving, and values analysis. Within the "process of thinking reflectively" approach, Haas identifies three subtypes: (a) "analysis of public issues," in which students are led to discuss and defend positions on controversial public policy issues; (b) "education for civic action," in which students are led not merely to debate and make decisions about policy issues but to follow through on their decisions through active participation in civic affairs; and (c) "modes of inquiry," in which students are led to develop and test hypotheses using the methods of scientific inquiry that are favored in history and the social sciences.

Haas notes that the "process of thinking reflectively" orientation toward reform of mainstream social studies teaching has shown itself in Dewey's emphasis on reflective thinking in the 1920s, the core curriculum movement in the 1930s, the life adjustment education movement in the 1940s, the "new social studies" programs and values education programs of the 1960s, and the development of programs emphasizing analysis of public issues and education for citizen action during the 1960s and 1970s. Meanwhile, calls by academicians for reform in the "intellectual aspects of history and the social sciences" tradition were influential in the 1930s and in the "new social studies" programs of the 1960s, and they are being voiced commonly once again in the late 1980s (especially by historians, geographers, and economists). Despite all of these reform pressures, however, the "conservative cultural continuity" approach has remained entrenched as the mainstream rationale for social studies education, particularly at the elementary level (Haas, 1979).

The Development of Social Studies as a School Subject

Before social studies acquired its name and became established as an interdisciplinary school subject concerned with citizen education, the social studies were represented in the curriculum in the form of courses or readings in history and civics. Citizen education had always been seen as an important function of schooling in the United States, and this function was underscored during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, when public school enrollments were mushrooming and curricula were becoming standardized, because the nation was absorbing millions of immigrants and feeling the need to inculcate in them democratic traditions and values and to prepare them to function as American citizens. This was especially true in the elementary grades, which would be the only schooling that most citizens would experience at the time. Partly because history became well organized as a discipline and began to take an active interest in what was being taught in the schools earlier than the social sciences did, and partly because its content fit well with the prevailing citizenship transmission concerns, citizenship education in these early years was heavily focused on history. Reflecting the thinking of the times, the report of a committee formed by the American Historical Association to recommend a curriculum for the elementary schools, issued in 1909, called for Indian life, historical aspects of Thanksgiving, the story of Washington, and local events for grades one and two; heroes of other times, Columbus, the Indians, and historical aspects of Independence Day for grade three; a biographical approach to American history in grades four and five; a course in Old World or European backgrounds of American history in grade six; and a combination of a chronological approach to American history and a parallel program in civics (emphasizing state and national governments) in grades seven and eight (Hertzberg, 1981).

Early in this century, the influence of the American Historical Association and other groups dominated by university-based professors in determining the content of the school curriculum gradually receded in favor of the influence of organizations dominated by school-based teachers and administrators, acting both individually and in concert through the newly formed National Education Association (NEA). An influential report issued in 1916 by an NEA committee established "social studies" as the name of the content area and argued that the area should be informed by several social science disciplines in addition to history, that social education should be its primary purpose, and that content selection should be guided by consideration of its personal meaning and relevance to the student and its value in preparing the student for citizenship (not just by the degree to which it is emphasized in the academic disciplines). These features have characterized social studies as taught in the schools ever since, despite competition among the various underlying disciplines for representation in the curriculum and competition among the five approaches described by Martorella (1985) concerning how the content should be handled and what kinds of activities and assignments should predominate.

In the elementary grades, the curriculum began to draw not only from history and civics, but from geography and economics, and later from psychology, sociology, and anthropology. Instruction gradually became dominated by textbooks that functioned primarily as storehouses of facts, the purview expanded from an almost exclusive focus on the United States to a more global orientation, and the emphasis on inculcation of American values broadened to include values analysis, decision making, critical thinking, and "life adjustment" skills.

The Expanding Communities Approach

Gradually, the expanding communities approach to the elementary school social studies curriculum became almost universal. This approach calls for beginning with the self and then expanding the purview to the family, the neighborhood, the community, the state, the nation, and the world. Thus, students study self, school, community, and home in kindergarten; families in grade one; neighborhoods in grade two; communities in grade three; state history and geographic regions in grade four; United States history in grade five; and world cultures (usually with emphasis on the western hemisphere) in grade six. Lengel and Superka (1982) examined a broad range of data and concluded that the following topics and themes are representative of those included in K-6 social studies programs:

Kindergarten: Self, home, school, community. Discovering myself (Who am I? How am I alike and different from others?), school (my classroom, benefits of school), working together, living at home, community helpers, children in other lands, rules, celebrating holidays, working and playing safely.

Grade One: Families. Family membership, recreation, work, cooperation, traditions, families in other cultures, how my family is alike and different from others, family responsibilities, my senses and feelings, the family at work, our school and other schools, and national holidays.

Grade Two: Neighborhoods. Workers and services in the neighborhood, food, shelter, and clothing, transportation, communication, living in different neighborhoods, my role within the neighborhood, neighborhoods and communities in other cultures, farm and city life, and protecting our environment.

Grade Three: Communities. Different kinds of communities, changes in communities, community government, community services, communities in other countries, cities, careers in cities, urban problems, business and industry, pioneers and American Indians, and communities past and present.

Grade Four: Geographic regions. Different world regions, people of the world, climatic regions, physical regions, population, food. Also, state history. Problems of our state, our state government, state history, people of our state, state laws, roles of state workers, communities past and present.

Grade Five: U.S. history. The first Americans, exploration and discovery, Colonial life, revolution and independence, westward movement, war between the states, immigrants, the Roaring 20s, life styles in the United States, values of the American people, our neighbors to the north and south, United States as world power, great American leaders.

Grade Six: World cultures/hemispheres. Political and economic systems, land and resources, people and their beliefs, comparative cultures.

- Western hemisphere: Early cultures of South America, the major contemporary South American countries, Central American countries, Canada, Mexico, historical beginnings of the western world. Eastern hemisphere: Ancient Greece and Rome, Middle Ages, Renaissance, Middle East, Europe, Africa, India, and China.

Besides the expanding communities framework, this listing of commonly taught concepts exemplifies the citizen education emphasis of social studies and the fact that concepts are drawn from various disciplines and blended to center on a topic rather than organized according to each separate discipline. The basic framework can accommodate most emerging topics (environmentalism, multicultural education, etc.) and can be taught with very different mixtures of the five traditions mentioned earlier. It also can be taught with very different degrees of emphasis on integration, causal explanation (in addition to mere description), and application of the content addressed, as well as with very different mixtures and degrees of emphasis on skills such as data gathering, critical thinking, or decision making. (Note that skills, and for the most part values and dispositions as well, are not included in this list of topics and themes; consequently, such skills, values, and dispositions may or may not be taught with reference to the topics and themes being studied at the time.)

Hanna (1963) rationalized the expanding communities approach as being both logical in starting with the family and then moving outward in progressively wider circles of influence to address the other communities in which humans live and convenient in allowing for a holistic, coordinated approach to the study of people living in societies. He recommended that students study the ways in which people in each community carry out nine basic human activities:

1. Protecting and conserving life and resources
2. Producing, exchanging, and consuming goods and services
3. Transporting goods and people
4. Communicating facts, ideas, and feelings
5. Providing education
6. Providing recreation
7. Organizing and governing
8. Expressing aesthetic and spiritual impulses
9. Creating new tools, technology, and institutions

Children would begin such study with smaller and more familiar communities and gradually deal with the same issues in studying larger and less familiar communities. Hanna's ideas appear sound and, if implemented as he envisioned, would produce systematic social studies instruction structured around his nine guiding questions. In practice, however, elementary social studies curricula are better described as ill-structured collections of factual expositions and skills exercises that follow the letter but not the spirit of Hanna's recommendations.

Curricula that follow the expanding communities approach also have been criticized for being too age-grade oriented, being too traditional and middle-class oriented in their treatment of families and communities; being sequenced according to adult rather than child logic (for example, a state is just as abstract a concept as a nation, and there is no necessary reason why children should study the state before studying the nation); fractionating the curriculum so that students do not get enough opportunity to see relationships that exist across communities; and failing to allow for integration of skills instruction with instruction in content (Joyce & Alleman-Brooks, 1982; Naylor & Diem, 1987). Yet the expanding communities structure remains entrenched, partly because it is familiar to teachers and used in all of the leading curriculum series, but also because so far it has proven possible to incorporate new content into it and adapt it in ways that respond to common criticisms without changing its basic structure.

Recently, the expanding communities approach has been attacked by critics who believe that the replacement of an emphasis on history (and to a lesser extent, civics, and geography) by an emphasis on sociology, economics, psychology, and anthropology in the curriculum of the primary grades has been a mistake (Bennett, 1986; Egan, 1982; Finn & Ravitch, 1988). These critics believe that the study of history should be the backbone of social and civic education and that history can be taught in the primary grades in personalized and dramatic ways that will be effective, not only in developing within students a sense of time and place within which to embed their social learning but also in continuously stimulating their interest and curiosity. Along with making the case for stressing history, geography, and civics throughout the elementary social studies curriculum, these critics also attack the content currently taught in the primary grades, as well as the expanding communities curricular organization that they associate with such content. Ravitch (1987), for example, dismisses much of the content taught in primary grade social studies curricula as "tot sociology," viewing it as mostly a collection of boring abstractions that students have no interest in and do not need to learn anyway (because they develop most of this knowledge through normal experiences outside of school). She goes on to note that the expanding communities approach was developed by progressive educators of the 1930s for reasons that have become obsolete, and that in any case, its relative merits have never been tested, let alone validated, against plausible alternatives.

Arguments for a return to emphasis on history, geography, and civics throughout the elementary social studies curriculum have made some headway, particularly in California where the State Department of Education has designed a new curriculum framework that reflects these ideas (California State Department of Education, 1987). Even if this trend should continue, however, it remains to be seen whether it will dislodge the expanding communities approach to curriculum organization that has proven to be remarkably resilient over several decades now. It is true that the expanding communities approach does not accommodate history as well as it accommodates the social sciences, so that widespread agreement to give primacy to history in elementary social education could succeed in dislodging the expanding communities framework. Most social educators, however, appear to want to continue to emphasize content drawn from the social sciences in addition to content drawn from history, so they can be expected to resist this trend. Even if they are unhappy with the typical primary grade curriculum, they may think in terms of changing its content or improving the way that this content is handled rather than in terms of abandoning the expanding communities framework. At least, this was the direction taken by earlier reform movements in social studies.

The "New Social Studies" of the 1960s

In the 1950s and 1960s, social studies curricula increasingly came under criticism for having moved too far in the direction of life adjustment goals and strayed too far from the underlying disciplines. Berelson (1963) argued that the claimed conflict between the aims of social studies to produce either good citizens or students knowledgeable in the social science disciplines was largely spurious, believing that the issue could be resolved by introducing students to the best available knowledge as a means to the end of producing responsible citizens. He argued that in addition to giving students some familiarity with the research methods of the disciplines, social studies education should help them to recognize cultural diversity and to acquire a critical stance for evaluating both one's own knowledge and the claims or arguments of others. He also argued that in addition to the structures of the disciplines, curriculum developers had to confront several issues peculiar to the social studies: student readiness to engage in the academic tasks suggested, the role of values and controversy stemming from the sensitivity of the social studies to matters of public or personal policy, and the unusually complex problems of curricular organization stemming from the federated nature of the social studies.

Nevertheless, the "new social studies" programs developed in the 1960s were built around conceptual organization structures stressed in the disciplines and featured discovery or inductive teaching and learning; use of the modes of inquiry of historians and social scientists; attempts to build in cumulative, sequential learning; the notion that any idea can be taught successfully in some form to any student of any age; content drawn from the newer social sciences; post-holing (focusing on one topic or situation in depth); and proliferation of new audiovisual materials (Hertzberg, 1981). These new programs were concentrated at the upper elementary and secondary levels and on the higher achieving students, but the ideas behind them influenced all curricula at all levels. Although these "new social studies" programs failed in the sense that they soon disappeared from the schools, they have had a lasting influence by causing traditional curricula to be rationalized more explicitly around key concepts and generalizations, to give more attention to peoples and cultures outside the United States and Western Europe, to introduce more content drawn from the newer social sciences and more controversial aspects of such content, and to allow for deeper study of fewer topics, more comparison and contrast, more emphasis on inquiry and discovery, and more use of multimedia materials (Hertzberg, 1981).

Criticisms of these "new social studies" programs and the thinking that went with them included

1. Their definitions of the disciplines were just snapshots of current situations, with little sense of historical development or where they were headed in the future
2. Terms such as structure, inquiry, or concept were vague, and it was difficult to apply the notion of structure to history and civics
3. No attention was given to scope and sequence problems that academics could ignore but schools could not
4. They made heavy, often unrealistic demands on the teacher or called for the use of impractical materials or tasks
5. They emphasized the brightest students without much consideration of other students
6. They emphasized the cognitive without much consideration of the affective

Hertzberg (1981) believed that the last criticism was especially significant because the "new social studies" programs were out of step with the times. Teachers wanted to be active instructors rather than mere implementors of materials, and the social and political ferment of the 1960s provided much more powerful and immediate citizen education material than the overly intellectualized analysis of discipline-based concepts that these programs offered. Thus, in the schools social studies moved into relevance and self-realization, and the student as academic inquirer was replaced by the student as social activist.

Engle and Longstreet (1972) offered an even more fundamental critique of discipline-based approaches in the process of arguing for critical thinking and decision making approaches structured around discussion of topics or issues.

They conceded the value of the disciplines as "maximum culminations of organized knowledge," but argued that

> in recognizing the value of the disciplines, we have unconsciously accepted the disciplines as the only source of organized knowledge. In so doing, we have ignored the fact that most of the decisions we make in our daily lives are neither referred to nor guided by the disciplines. (p. 2)

They went on to point out that humans organize and reorganize their experiences into their own individual cognitive structures that fit their personal needs, rather than on the basis of structures used in the disciplines. They also noted that disciplines concern themselves with small and intentionally isolated segments of existence, thus producing knowledge that is fragmented, abstract, and theoretical. They argued that such disciplinary knowledge is suitable for teaching to older students who are capable of appreciating its value, but that elementary students need a topical approach that is better adapted to the realities of human situational learning and the ability of these students to see different forms of learning as relevant and comprehensible. By considering a topic in all of its aspects (rather than addressing only those aspects that fit within a particular discipline at any given time), and by considering it within the context of its implications for personal decision making, students should find social studies instruction relevant and meaningful rather than distant and abstract. Thus, in the elementary grades, social education should emphasize the individual student's need for relevance, saving emphasis on society's needs (e.g., for individuals trained in the disciplines) for later.

Many current social educators (probably the majority of the membership of National Council for the Social Studies [NCSS]) share these views. Bragaw and Hartoonian (1988), for example, drawing heavily from Raskin and Bernstein (1987) in developing their rationale, suggest that social studies should concentrate on teaching students to understand how the world actually is and operates and prepare them for the "creation of knowledge patterns that no longer fit neatly into Aristotelian and Germanic discipline structures" (p. 17).

The 1970s and 1980s

The emphasis in the late 1960s and early 1970s social studies classes was on personal development and citizen education accomplished through class discussion and projects concerned with values conflict and moral dilemmas, social and political issues (racism, sexism, the Vietnam War, Watergate), and nontraditional topics such as urbanization, environmental studies, and futurism. Games and simulation activities became popular along with discussion and values analysis activities. Classes that moved in these directions often went too far, and a common criticism at the time was that social studies had begun to place too much emphasis on process and not enough on establishing a coherent content base (Hertzberg, 1981; Kaltsounis, 1987).

At this point, the stage was set for development of more balanced and integrated approaches that would combine the best elements of the traditional emphasis on social education accomplished through cultural transmission with the best elements of the newer social science/inquiry and values analysis/decision making approaches. However, progress was slowed by the "back to basics" movement, which had the effect of reducing the time allocated to social studies in teachers' weekly schedules and introducing social studies curricula designed with as much emphasis on language arts goals as on social education goals. In these curricula, many of the suggested classroom activities may focus, for example, on identifying the main idea in a paragraph rather than on the social science concepts or citizen action implications of its content. Prominent in the early 1980s, these curricula now seem to be receding in favor of curricula that once again focus on social education goals.

Reflecting current thinking among leaders in the field, Kaltsounis (1987) calls for a balanced and integrated approach that he sums up in his concept of the "dynamic" curriculum. A good dynamic curriculum would meet the following conditions:

1. Built around cohesive content that is both (a) drawn from the social sciences and (b) related to the students and their social context
2. Selects and presents knowledge not as an end in itself but as a means to assist students in determining courses of action to improve society and their places in it
3. Includes attention to the social values that must be considered in making decisions about such courses of action
4. Stresses assessment of these social values by the students for possible voluntary acceptance (as opposed to inculcation leading to involuntary acceptance)
5. Develops in students the skills to acquire knowledge and values and to apply them in making decisions

Most other authors of contemporary textbooks on social studies teaching make similar statements, calling for reaffirmation of citizen education (i.e., not training in the social science disciplines or development of personal life adjustment skills) as the primary purpose of school social studies and for a balanced and integrated approach that incorporates the best elements of earlier approaches (recognizing these as sound ideas when not carried to extremes). There is relatively more emphasis now on thinking than on memorizing, and relatively more emphasis on principles and causal relationships than on facts and definitions. Some of this emphasis can be seen as well in the latest editions of elementary curriculum series; the extent to which it has begun to influence teaching practice remains unknown.

The Current NCSS Guidelines

Statements representing the current consensus among leaders in the field are issued periodically by the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). In 1981, the NCSS released a statement on the essentials of social studies, developed as part of a larger effort to collaborate with professional associations representing other subject matter areas to reaffirm the value of a balanced education and describe its characteristics. This larger effort produced agreement that the overarching goal of education is to develop informed, thinking citizens capable of participating in both domestic and world affairs and that such an education would be designed with recognition of the interdependence among the different disciplines and between the skills and content taught within each. This implies that content and skills will be taught in an integrated manner rather than separately, and that instruction will include sufficient attention to applications and higher order thinking and problem solving.

Turning to the essentials of the social studies, the NCSS statement begins by emphasizing the importance of citizen participation in public life and the need for effective social studies programs to help prepare young people to be able to identify, understand, and work to solve the problems that face our diverse nation and interdependent world. Organized according to a professionally designed scope and sequence, such programs would:

1. Begin in preschool and continue throughout formal education and include a range of related electives at the secondary level
2. Foster individual and cultural identity
3. Include observation of and participation in the school and community as part of the curriculum
4. Deal with critical issues and the world as it really is
5. Prepare students to make decisions based on democratic principles
6. Demand high standards of performance and measure student success by means that require more than the memorization of information
7. Depend on innovative teachers broadly prepared in history, the humanities, the social sciences, and educational theory and practice
8. Involve community members as resources for program development and student involvement
9. Lead to citizen participation in public affairs

Elaborating on these criteria, the NCSS identified the following as essentials for programs that would contribute not only to the development of students' capacity to read and compute, but also to link knowledge and skills with an understanding of and commitment to democratic principles and their application.

Knowledge

Classroom instruction relating content to information drawn from the media and from experience would focus on the following areas of knowledge:

1. History and culture of our nation and the world
2. Geography--physical, political, cultural, and economic
3. Government--theories, systems, structures and processes
4. Economics--theories, systems, structures and processes
5. Social institutions--the individual, the group, the community and the society
6. Intergroup and interpersonal relationships
7. Worldwide relationships of all sorts between and among nations, races, cultures and institutions

From this knowledge base, exemplary programs would teach skills, concepts, and generalizations that can help students to understand the sweep of human affairs and ways of managing conflict that are consistent with democratic procedures.

Democratic Beliefs

Fundamental beliefs drawn from the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution form the basic principles of our democratic constitutional order. These democratic beliefs depend on such practices as due process, equal protection, and civic participation, and are rooted in the concepts of justice, equality, responsibility, freedom, diversity, and privacy. Exemplary school programs would not indoctrinate students to accept these ideas blindly, but would present knowledge about their historical derivation and contemporary application essential to understanding our society and its institutions. Such ideas not only would be discussed as they relate to curriculum and current affairs but also would be mirrored by teachers in their classrooms and embodied in the school's daily operations.

Thinking Skills

It is important that students connect knowledge with beliefs and action. To do that, thinking skills can be developed systematically throughout the years of formal schooling. Fundamental to the goals of social studies education are those skills that help assure rational behavior in social settings. These can be grouped into four major categories:

> Data-gathering skills. Learning to acquire information by observation, locate information from a variety of sources, compile, organize, and evaluate information, extract and interpret information, and communicate orally and in writing.
>
> Intellectual skills. Learning to compare things, ideas, events, and situations on the basis of similarities and differences, classify or group items in categories, ask appropriate and searching questions, draw conclusions or inferences from evidence, arrive at general ideas, and make sensible predictions from generalizations.
>
> Decision-making skills. Learning to consider alternative solutions, consider the consequences of each solution, make decisions and justify them in relationship to democratic principles, and act on the basis of those decisions.
>
> Interpersonal skills. Learning to see things from the point of view of others; understand one's own beliefs, feelings, abilities, and shortcomings and how they affect relations with others; use group generalizations without stereotyping and arbitrarily classifying individuals; recognize value in individuals different from oneself and groups different from one's own; work effectively with others as a group member; give and receive constructive criticism; and accept responsibility and respect the rights and property of others.

Participation Skills

As a civic participant, the individual uses the knowledge, beliefs, and skills learned in the school, the social studies classroom, the community, and the family as the basis for action. Connecting the classroom with the community provides opportunities for students to learn the basic skills of participation, from observation to advocacy. To teach participation, social studies programs need to emphasize the following kinds of skills: (a) working effectively in groups--organizing, planning, making decisions, and taking action; (b) forming coalitions of interest with other groups; (c) persuading, compromising, and bargaining; (d) practicing patience and perseverance in working for one's goal; and (e) developing experience in cross-cultural situations.

Civic Action

Effective social studies programs will provide students not only with the knowledge and skills needed to become active and effective civic participants, but also with the disposition to do so (NCSS, 1981).

Even this brief summary of guidelines from the NCSS statement on the essentials of the social studies may seem overwhelming to a classroom teacher. Yet, the NCSS essentials statement is just the tip of the iceberg. NCSS has also published much more detailed curriculum guidelines and reports of task forces concerned with the scope and sequence of the social studies curriculum. Lengthy lists of objectives also appear in the scope and sequence charts shown in the teachers' editions of the textbooks used in the schools, and states and local districts often publish lengthy lists of social studies objectives as well.

These lists usually show a great deal of overlap and are organized according to the *four types of goals* described in the NCSS list: *knowledge*, *skills*, *values* or beliefs, and *citizen participation* (including both dispositions and action goals). Still, they are overwhelming. In addition to everything that might be expected based on what has been said so far, elementary level social studies curricula include material on such topics as pedestrian and bicycle safety and use of the telephone during emergencies. Coupled with the diversity of content addressed, the sheer number and variety of objectives included in a typical social studies scope and sequence statement are likely to be daunting to teachers.

Furthermore, such statements are not very prescriptive despite their length. They tend to be written so generally that almost any content or lesson could be justified as relevant to them, and yet when one looks at particular lessons, it often is difficult to ascertain what larger goals these lessons are intended to accommodate. For example, Naylor and Diem (1987) cite the following hierarchy of curriculum goals as typical for social studies:

> District wide goal (taken from the NCSS guidelines): to prepare young people to become humane, rational, participating citizens in a world that is becoming increasingly interdependent.
>
> Program-area goal for social studies, K-12: to enable students to recognize and appreciate that people living in different cultures and subcultures are likely to share some common values with other cultures and subcultures and to hold other different values that are rooted in experience and legitimate in terms of their own culture or subculture.
>
> Grade-level goal for social studies, Grade 1: to understand and appreciate that the roles and values of family members may differ according to the structure of the family, its circumstances, and its cultural setting.
>
> Unit-level goal for social studies, Grade 1: to understand that families differ in size and composition. (p.51)

Besides being open to criticism as rather trite for a unit goal even at the first-grade level, the last (unit-level) goal is phrased in purely descriptive, knowledge-level language. It makes no reference either to the anthropological and sociological concepts or to the values and dispositions alluded to in the higher level goals. Unless the teacher (through unusually effective teacher education) has acquired and can operationalize a coherent view of the purposes and nature of social studies, or unless the manual that accompanies the curriculum series does an unusually good job of keeping the teacher aware of how particular lessons fit within the big picture, the result is likely to be a program long on isolated practice of facts or skills and short on integration and application. Research on teachers' curriculum gatekeeping in social studies (reviewed in Thornton, in press) suggests that most teachers are uncertain or confused about the purpose of social studies instruction and that their planning and teaching are influenced at least as much by their disciplinary training, their own ideosyncratic ideas about teaching, and their concerns about convenience and classroom control as by the rationales propounded by scholars.

Intended Versus Enacted Curricula

What actually occurs in the classroom will depend on where the policy setters, curriculum designers, and (especially) teachers stand on the continuing issues and tensions that divide the field (Atwood, 1986; Hertzberg, 1981; McKenzie, 1986; Mehlinger & Davis, 1981; Shaver, 1981). One of these is the degree to which the social studies are seen as serving the ends of society by promoting good citizens versus serving the ends of the individual student by promoting life adjustment goals. Related to this is the issue of relative emphasis on personal versus local versus national versus global perspectives. Another is the treatment of values, particularly the relative emphasis on inculcating particular values versus teaching students to examine values and take this information into account when making decisions.

Elementary teachers typically favor a citizenship training emphasis, teaching of a broad range of facts, and inculcation of traditional and locally favored values. In contrast, university-based theorists and curriculum designers tend to place more emphasis on concepts and generalizations drawn from the disciplines, addressing less content in greater depth and with more emphasis on application, and a critical stance toward values and traditions (with the exception of the democratic core values of justice, equality, responsibility, freedom, diversity, and privacy). University-based scholars tend to criticize teachers for relying too much on textbooks, teaching isolated facts and skills without enough emphasis on coherent structures and application opportunities, being overly accepting of textbook content as valid and teaching in ways that inculcate positive attitudes toward the nation and the status quo, and being overly pessimistic about what their students are capable of learning. Teachers tend to criticize university-based scholars for being too academic and middle class in their orientation; overemphasizing generalizations from the social sciences that can be substantiated or proven while underemphasizing humanistic or value elements and content that is important in the students' lives or currently in the news; underemphasizing the need for direct teaching and a strong base of concepts and factual information before undertaking problem solving; and overemphasizing experimentation, inquiry/discovery exercises, and other activities that are either impractical for classroom use or not worth the time and trouble that they require (Mehlinger & Davis, 1981; Shaver, 1987).

Another continuing issue is the degree to which the selection or sequencing of content should be based on students' interests or cognitive development, on disciplinary criteria, or on citizenship preparation criteria. The curriculum guidelines issued by the NCSS list a variety of criteria, but they begin with the criterion that social studies programs should be directly related to the age, maturity, and concerns of students. The second criterion calls for such programs to deal with the real social world by coming to grips with pervasive and enduring social issues, addressing currently controversial issues, and providing social and citizen participation opportunities. The academic disciplines are not mentioned until the third criterion, which calls for programs to draw from currently valid knowledge representative of human experience, culture, and beliefs. Here the guidelines mention the content and methods of inquiry and data analysis used in history and the social sciences, but also add that the program should draw from other related fields such as law, the humanities, the natural and applied sciences, and religion.

Other criteria are that curriculum, instruction, and evaluation should be designed around clearly formulated objectives and that learning activities should engage students directly and actively in the learning process by causing them to use knowledge, examine values, communicate with others, make decisions about social and civic affairs, formulate and test hypotheses, gather and analyze data, and participate in community activities. There is also mention of the need to structure programs to help students organize their experiences to promote growth, learn how to continue to learn, and be able to relate their experiences in social studies to other areas of experience. Elaborating on this, the guidelines suggest that learning can be structured either around basic concepts, principles, and methods drawn from the *social sciences* or around analysis of the causes, consequences, and possible resolutions of *social issues*. They go on to say that it would be inadequate to limit programs to courses in the individual disciplines, because input from many disciplines is needed to address the complex and enduring social issues that social studies courses should be focusing on in the first place. Here again, we see the NCSS's emphasis on citizenship education, not introduction to the disciplines, as the main purpose of social studies.

Contemporary Discontent and Reform Proposals

Many contemporary scholars look back fondly on the 1960s and 1970s as a period of energy and innovation in social studies curriculum and instruction, but view the 1980s as a period of retreat from innovation, reduction of alternatives, and homogenizing of the curriculum (Naylor & Diem, 1987). These and related concerns have led the NCSS to establish a national commission to reassess the basic goals of social studies and also to sponsor efforts to develop alternative scope and sequence designs. It remains to be seen what will develop from these NCSS initiatives (the history-social science framework published by the California State Department of Education is based primarily on the ideas of history-oriented critics working outside of, and largely in opposition to, the traditions emphasized within the NCSS).

Discontent focuses in particular on the primary grades, where there is widespread agreement that there is not enough content taught and that much of the content that is taught does not need to be taught. There is little agreement about how to remedy these problems, however. Some would stick with the expanding communities structure but improve the content. Others would stick with this structure but replace an emphasis on explication of content with an emphasis on discussion of current issues and problems. Among those who would modify or eliminate the expanding communities structure, many would favor a history-oriented curriculum organized along the general lines suggested in the California framework, but others would organize the content around the social sciences more so than around history (for example, many would favor a curriculum that emphasized understanding of the customs and cultures of a variety of societies from around the world, drawing content from anthropology, sociology, and those aspects of geography that emphasize relationships between people and their environments). Thus, contemporary debate about the purposes and nature of elementary social studies instruction may result in greater variety rather than in the replacement of the current de facto national curriculum with another de facto national curriculum.

Higher Order Thinking and Problem Solving in Social Studies

So far, this paper has identified citizen education as the transcendent purpose of social studies instruction, described competing views about how this purpose should be accomplished, provided a historical account of how the elementary social studies curriculum in the United States has evolved in response to these competing views and other influences, and summarized contemporary views as exemplified by the NCSS guidelines and the criticisms that have been leveled against the de facto national curriculum. The paper now moves to a focus on higher order thinking and problem solving in social studies.

Most of what is said in the social studies literature on higher order thinking and problem solving concerns application of knowledge in the process of critical thinking, decision making, and citizen participation activities. Possibly because it is assumed that the expanding communities approach ensures such understanding, there is relatively little mention of the meaningful understanding aspects of higher order thinking. Furthermore, descriptions of instructional strategies are usually phrased in terms of first learning and only then applying knowledge; not much is said about enhancing the meaningfulness of such instruction by couching it within a realistic application context from the beginning. Programs built around Dewey's notions of reflective thinking, Bruner's notions of disciplined inquiry, or various approaches to the study of social issues and problems all imply that inquiry/decision making activities will promote comprehension as well as application of knowledge, but they tend to focus on these activities rather than on the knowledge itself.

In short, most of what is available in the social studies literature on higher order thinking and problem solving concerns processes (procedural knowledge) rather than content (propositional knowledge), and the processes are often taught more or less independently of the content drawn from the disciplines. Designers of curricula that focus on analysis of social problems and issues can even justify this to an extent, although this is much less true for designers of curricula built around the social science disciplines or around systematic comparison and contrast of communities, cultures, nations, and so forth.

Comprehension of Content Knowledge

Scholarly discussions of intended outcomes in social studies typically refer to knowledge, beliefs or values, and skills. The term "knowledge" usually is given broad meaning, subsuming not only facts but concepts, generalizations, principles, and theories. Some authors use terms such as "comprehension" or "understandings" instead of "knowledge" to help underscore this point. In any case, to the extent that these terms are meant to include meaningful understanding of coherent networks of information, not just rote memorizing of isolated facts, they imply higher order thinking.

True comprehension of concepts in social studies, as in other content areas, goes far beyond the ability to give accurately paraphrased definitions of the concepts. It would include knowledge of how the concept relates to other concepts within larger networks and how it might apply to the analysis and potential solution of a range of problems. Explication and application of concepts can be trickier in social studies than in mathematics or science because the concepts often refer to fuzzy rather than clearly defined sets, their relationships are often merely correlational rather than clearly causal, and predictions based on them are often merely probabilistic rather than logically and empirically necessary. Still, it seems reasonable to expect that mastery of key economics concepts would lead one to make good personal money management decisions and develop clearly articulated and defensible positions on national economic issues, that a good knowledge of history would help one to avoid historically counterproductive behavior and make good decisions in managing one's life (as well as to help one's community or nation do the same through activities as a citizen), and so on.

Most experts writing about curriculum in social studies mention the need to structure the content around powerful concepts and generalizations and to teach integrated strands of content in sufficient depth to ensure comprehension as described above. This curriculum scope and organization goal is very difficult to achieve in social studies, however, because of its multidisciplinary nature and its attempt to address current social problems. For example, Herman (1983) reported the findings of an NCSS survey of members' beliefs about where particular content should be taught in the curriculum that included the following categories of content: anthropology, career education, citizenship education, consumer education, contemporary issues, death and dying, economics, energy education, future studies, geography, global education, history, legal education, moral education, multicultural education, philosophy, political science, psychology, religion studies, science in society, sex equity education, social psychology, and urban studies.

Even after decisions are made concerning which of these fields of content to emphasize, criteria are needed for identifying powerful concepts around which to structure the curricula. Several scholars have suggested such criteria. Armento (1986) suggested including concepts according to the following criteria: (a) commonality of use in discipline-based writings, (b) power to serve as an organizing basis for comprehending other superordinate and subordinate concepts and examples, (c) usability for application to a great range of examples, and (d) validity in terms of generally agreed upon definitions. Similarly, Taba, Durkin, Fraenkel, and McNaughton (1971) suggested that desirable concepts display: (a) validity (adequately represent ideas of the discipline from which they are drawn); (b) significance (can explain important segments of the world today); (c) appropriateness (suited to the needs, interests, and maturational level of the students); (d) durability (are of lasting importance); and (e) balance (permit development of both scope and depth). Michaelis (1976) suggested judging content according to the following questions: (a) Can it be used to develop key concepts, main ideas, processes, skills, attitudes, or values? (b) Is it related to significant human problems, the real social world, or the concerns of the students? (c) Is it valid, reliable, and up to date? (d) Is it adaptable to the students' capabilities and backgrounds? (e) Are relevant instructional materials readily available? Kaltsounis (1987) suggested the following criteria: (a) The content is considered important by social scientists, (b) it provides for comprehensive treatment of the various areas of study, (c) it allows for consideration of the local scene, and (d) it addresses important contemporary issues.

There are many similarities in these lists of criteria for selecting content, including the tendency to take into account not only the prominence of the concept within the underlying discipline but also its relevance to the students' personal experiences and its usefulness in accomplishing citizen education goals. Applications of such criteria have yielded a fair amount of overlap in lists of powerful concepts suggested for emphasis in social studies curricula.

Ratcliffe (cited in Fraenkel, 1980), for example, identified the following as concepts used in writings by scholars from at least four different disciplines: attitudes, behavior, change, culture, democracy, environment, government, group, interaction, institution, mobility, motivation, norm, personality, power, resources, role, social structure, society, socialization, system, trade, and values. Taba et al. (1971) built their social studies program around the following concepts: causality, conflict, cultural change, differences, institutions, interdependence, modification, power, societal control, tradition, and values. The State of California suggested the following concepts as keys to the social studies curriculum in a 1974 publication: change, citizenship, conflict, culture, diversity, environment, freedom, interdependence, justice, morality, multiple causation, power/authority, property, resources, needs, scarcity, social control, and truth (cited in Fraenkel, 1980).

Key concepts within the underlying social studies disciplines include the following: (from history) change, leadership, conflict, cooperation, nationalism, exploration, and historical bias; (from sociology) socialization, roles, norms and sanctions, values, social movement, and society; (from anthropology) culture, diffusion, tradition, acculturation, ethnocentrism, cultural relativism, and rite of passage; (from political science) power, social control, state, interest group, political socialization, and political participation; (from economics) scarcity, production, interdependence, specialization and division of labor, and voluntary exchange; and (from geography) location, spatial interaction, urban spatial patterns, internal structure of a city, cultural diffusion, and environmental perception (Banks, 1985).

Many social educators advocate developing curricula around powerful concepts drawn from the disciplines such as those exemplified in previous paragraphs. Other social educators (e.g., Fraenkel, 1980) accept such concepts as basic but believe that curricula designed around concepts will be too static, so they advocate designing curricula around generalizations that express relationships between concepts. Generalizations are inherently more powerful and integrative than concepts, and they have added value as key ideas around which to design curricula because they provide a basis for testing predictions or causal explanations and thus make it easier to couch instruction within problem-solving or other application contexts.

Proponents of discipline-based social studies curricula typically advocate structuring such curricula around powerful concepts and generalizations drawn from the disciplines. Social studies curricula have also been organized, however, around particular topics such as area studies or cultural comparisons. This approach is popular among those who want social studies to be an interdisciplinary-based school subject different from history and the social sciences. Social studies curricula have also been developed around issues or questions to be resolved through inquiry and debate, an approach that is popular with proponents of critical thinking and decision making models. Engle and Ochoa (1988), for example, suggest that teachers use five general types of questions to stimulate reflection and decision making about the topics under study:

1. Definitional questions (asked and followed up to make the point that different definitions can be offered with different agendas behind them, rather than with the intention of identifying a particular definition as necessarily correct)
2. Evidential questions (what evidence can students cite in support of their answers?)
3. Policy questions (what should be done about social problems?)
4. Value questions (what are the values that underlie these suggested solutions to policy questions?)
5. Speculative questions (what might have happened if things developed or were done differently?)

Instead of looking for correct answers and reinforcing them, the teacher's role is to question students' answers, present or elicit discrepant points of view, and stimulate and moderate discussion. Michaelis (1988) has noted that three different general modes of inquiry can be used to organize the study of any particular content:

1. Generalizing studies (analyze a topic in depth in several settings to compare, contrast, and draw generalizations)
2. Particularizing studies (study a single person, place, or event in depth to develop a comprehensive view)

3. Decision-making studies (study an issue or problem in order to make decisions)

When curricula are organized around the study of particular cultures or societies (past or present), it may make more sense to organize the material around foci for comparison and contrast rather than around concepts per se. The Hanna (1963) list of nine basic human activities that could be used as the basis for comparing communities has already been mentioned. Similarly, Fraenkel (1980) suggests that systematic study and comparison of societies can be facilitated by applying the following list of questions:

1. Who were the people being studied?
2. When did they live?
3. Where did they live?
4. What things did they leave behind that tell us something about them?
5. What kinds of work did they do and where did they do it?
6. What objects or things did they produce or create?
7. What did they do for recreation?
8. What kinds of family patterns did they develop?
9. How did they educate their young?
10. How did they govern and control the society?
11. What customs and beliefs did they hold?
12. What events, individuals, or ideas are they especially known for, and how did these affect their lives?
13. What problems did they have?
14. How did they attempt to deal with these problems?

Fraenkel goes on to suggest that "content samples" selected for analysis should meet the following criteria:

1. Emphasize the most fundamental or theoretical knowledge possible, drawing on the most powerful concepts and generalizations that the disciplines have to offer

2. Focus on content that contributes to multiple objectives (he criticizes MACOS and other programs that focus on exotic societies and practices as failing according to this criterion)

3. Emphasize comparisons (both to avoid ethnocentrism in concentrating too much on the United States and to help teach concepts through comparison)

4. Do not concentrate just on the past, emphasize the present

5. Be reality-oriented, dealing with real people, emotions, and life situations

6. Be relevant to student concerns

7. Provide frequent opportunities for value inquiry and analysis.

Fraenkel's ideas are representative of those who favor a multidisciplinary social studies curriculum. Those who favor heavy emphasis on history typically do not say much about organizing the content around key concepts, but they do emphasize the importance of teaching for meaningful understanding (Bennett, 1986; California State Department of Education, 1987; Finn & Ravitch, 1988; Ravitch, 1987). They state or imply that this will be accomplished through (a) helping students to appreciate continuities and see how events developed or ideas evolved; (b) personalizing history around the richly described motives and actions of key individuals with whom the students can identify, so as to maximize the personal relevance and concrete meaningfulness of the content; and (c) including activities that require students to debate the relative merits of the courses of action advocated or taken by historical figures, to predict what might have happened if events had developed differently, or to consider how the lessons of the past might apply to current issues.

Even though they commonly state that curriculum and instruction should be designed around powerful concepts, few sources have much to say about teaching networks of related concepts, generalizations, principles, and theories in ways that will promote meaningful understanding. Methods texts frequently present and contrast didactic/deductive methods and discovery/inductive methods of teaching individual concepts, but do not say much about the nature of classroom discourse or about integrating and applying networks of concepts within problem-solving contexts (see Prawat, 1988, on this point).

In textbooks on teaching strategies for the social studies, discussions of tactics for developing comprehension typically stress the importance of asking the students "comprehension questions" (as they would be classified within the Bloom taxonomy) about the concepts, generalizations, and principles that they are learning. Comprehension questions require students to (a) translate (into their own words or into equivalent terms); (b) interpret (relate things to one another, impose or change a sequence, compare or contrast, separate essentials from nonessentials); or (c) extrapolate (predict or estimate an event from a known pattern or trend) (Banks, 1985). In particular, compare/contrast questions are often recommended as ways to stimulate and assess students' comprehension of concepts, and prediction questions are often recommended as ways to stimulate and assess students' ability to apply a generalization or principle.

Learning of Skills, Strategies, and Processes

As noted previously, the NCSS statement on the essentials of the social studies identifies four sets of thinking skills (data gathering skills, intellectual skills, decision making skills, and interpersonal skills) each with several subcategories, and other sources of information to teachers include even longer lists of skills. Criticisms of the way skills are handled in social studies center on two problems: Skills instruction is often separate from content instruction and skills instruction is atomized into exercises on subskills without enough opportunities to "put it all together" by doing the whole task of problem solving, decision making, or critical analysis of documents (Glaser, 1984; Marzano et al., 1988).

Much of this fractionation of the skills components of the social studies can be avoided, however, if curriculum and instruction are couched within a citizen education emphasis that reflects the shared thinking of most of the leaders in the field. Parker and Jarolimek (1984), for example, have already been cited for their assertion that a successful social studies program will produce a citizen who is *informed*, *skilled* in the processes of a free society, committed to *democratic values*, and who *feels obligated to participate* in social, political, and economic processes. Martorella (1985) expresses a similar view in asserting that good social studies programs will develop citizens who are reflective, competent, and concerned. *Reflective* citizens possess knowledge of a body of facts, concepts, and generalizations concerning the organization, understanding, and development of individuals, groups, and societies; also, they understand the processes of hypothesis formation and testing, problem solving, and decision making. *Competent* citizens possess skills for collecting data systematically and accurately, identifying and using reference sources, processing and interpreting data, and organizing information chronologically and spatially; they also possess social skills for group participation, communication, observation, and multicultural understanding. *Concerned* citizens are aware of their rights and responsibilities, possess a sense of social consciousness and a well-grounded framework for deciding what is right or wrong, and have learned how to identify and analyze issues and to suspend judgment concerning alternative beliefs, attitudes, values, customs, and cultures. Solomon (1987) notes that fulfillment of the NCSS objectives implies that social studies education will develop in students a *commitment to rational processes* for generating, validating, or applying knowledge. Rational processes subsume both logical and empirical modes of knowing as well as strategies for evaluating information and making decisions.

Following Engle (1960) and Engle and Longstreet (1972), many social educators believe that teachers can address most of these goals and develop most of the skills required to achieve them if they couch their social studies instruction within a decision making/problem solving/critical thinking framework. By engaging their students in these higher order processes as they relate to citizen education goals, teachers can simultaneously link their instruction in skills and processes with their instruction in social studies content and provide opportunities for practice of subskills within a context of application to meaningful problem solving and decision making activities.

Speaking of content teaching in general (not just in social studies), Marzano et al. (1988) argued that instead of attempting to teach thinking skills by teaching dozens of discrete subskills in presumed hierarchical order, schools should define a limited number of core skills for each content area and focus on teaching these core skills in gradually more challenging learning contexts. What would be sequenced from easy to difficult would not be a broad array of discrete subskills, but rather the content and tasks. Early instruction would feature relatively easy tasks built around concrete and familiar material, and the teacher would provide considerable modeling, coaching, cuing, and other scaffolding. Gradually, students would be encouraged to apply higher order thinking skills (critical thinking, decision making, etc.) to more difficult tasks built around less concrete and familiar material, and with less scaffolding from the teacher.

Decision Making, Problem Solving, and Critical Thinking

Problem solving and decision making activities are similar in many respects, although social studies educators tend to distinguish between them because of the special importance of decision making to citizen education goals. In the social studies, the term problem solving is associated with the inquiry activities built into the "new social studies" programs of the 1960s, and thus with an academic, social-studies-as-social-science approach. Problem solving implies seeking explanations for observed phenomena or addressing relatively well-formed and noncontroversial questions that can be resolved by evidence alone (without having to take into account values and without necessarily carrying the process through to some kind of action based on the obtained solution to the problem). In contrast, decision making is seen as the making of reasoned choices from among several alternatives, where reasoned choices are based on judgments consistent with one's values and on relevant, sound information. The decisions involved may be purely personal or concerned with public issues, but making them requires consideration of both values and evidence, and once made, the decisions have implications for personal action (Cassidy & Kurfman, 1977; Kaltsounis, 1987; Naylor & Diem, 1987).

Kaltsounis (1987) identifies five steps in the problem solving paradigm: (a) become aware of the problem, (b) gather data, (c) form hypotheses, (d) test these hypotheses, and (e) reach conclusions. Where this problem solving paradigm cannot yield a clear solution, one must switch to the decision making paradigm and address values as well as data. Naylor and Diem (1987) include the following eight steps in the decision making paradigm:

1. Recognize the situation as one in which a decision is to made
2. Clarify the problem
3. Identify relevant values
4. Indicate the desired outcome (goal)
5. Propose and consider a range of potential alternatives
6. Project the likely consequences for each alternative (both positive and negative)
7. Choose the best alternative based on analysis of projected consequences and consistency with the stated goal and one's values
8. Apply the decision and assess the consequences.

What problem solving and decision making have in common is that the person will become aware of a need (e.g., to solve a problem or make a decision) and will address it using what Solomon (1987) calls *rational processes*: He or she will analyze the situation, determine what additional information is needed, obtain and assess that information, and then follow through by drawing conclusions that are consistent with the information. To the extent that the person is not already in possession of the needed information (stored in memory and accessible when needed), he or she will need to read, gather data, conduct experiments, or otherwise collect and synthesize this information. In the process, the person will draw upon the various data gathering skills, intellectual skills, and decision making skills that are mentioned in the NCSS statement of essentials. Thus, to the extent that teachers couch their social studies instruction within a decision making/problem solving framework, opportunities to provide instruction and practice of the subskills involved in making decisions or solving problems will occur naturally and frequently.

So will opportunities for teaching and practicing *critical thinking*, which social studies educators define as the process of determining the authenticity, accuracy, or worth of information or knowledge claims (Beyer, 1985) or as the evaluation of evidence of argument, based on acceptable standards, for the purpose of accepting or rejecting a statement (Feely, 1983). Critical thinking is thought to be an especially important goal of citizen education because citizens need to be able to distinguish verified from unsubstantiated claims, assess the reliability of information, determine the factual accuracy of statements, distinguish relevant from irrelevant information, detect bias, identify unstated assumptions, recognize logical fallacies in reasoning, and so on, if they are to make intelligent voting decisions (as well as consumer purchase decisions or other personal life adjustment decisions).

Decision making and problem solving situations provide natural opportunities for students to engage in critical thinking as they assess the relevance, importance, and value of the information they collect in the process of testing hypotheses or comparing decision alternatives. This is also a natural way to integrate social criticism components into the curriculum, because students can be taught to critically evaluate documents or statements not only in terms of criteria such as logic or relevance but also in terms of the degree to which they define issues in ways that favor maintenance of the status quo, fail to take into account the concerns of the powerless, and so on.

The notion of couching instruction within a decision making/problem solving (including emphasis on critical thinking) framework subsumes most of the other conceptions or methods that have been suggested for building higher order thinking into social studies, such as reflective thinking (Banks, 1985) or jurisprudential reasoning (Oliver & Shaver, 1966). It implies that content will be addressed at least in part with an emphasis on issues and controversial questions, not just the facts, concepts, generalizations, and theories surrounding powerful ideas drawn from the underlying disciplines. A topic such as racism, for example, would be approached less with emphasis on tracing its history than with emphasis on recognizing its manifestations and effects in the contemporary world and debating how these might be reduced. This approach would draw more on content from psychology and sociology than from history, and it would call for allocating significant time to activities designed to get students to analyze their own values and make decisions relating to racism or to generate solutions to racism as a social problem. Although there is a great deal of room for integration of the teaching of social science content with citizen education and personal development activities (as well as the perception that much more of this integration should be going on than is occurring now), the racism example also illustrates that there are limits to what can be accomplished through this approach. Beyond some optimal level of integration, social science goals, citizen education goals, and personal development goals begin to diverge, so that time allocated for activities in pursuit of one of these sets of goals is lost from the time available for allocation to the other sets of goals. Thus, besides presenting the challenge of how to adjust instruction so as to do a better job with higher order thinking goals, social studies curriculum issues raise fundamental questions about what kinds of higher order thinking goals to emphasize in the first place.

Some social educators have opposed the notion of couching social studies teaching within a decision-making framework or have criticized the arguments commonly advanced in favor of doing so. Proponents of discipline-based approaches who would like to see social studies curricula offer courses in history or in some of the social sciences are especially likely to oppose the decision making approach, because it typically leads to curricula organized around multidisciplinary treatment of diverse topics and discussion of current policy issues instead of systematic treatment of content drawn primarily from a single academic discipline. These scholars believe that decision-making approaches leave students without systematic knowledge of history, geography, and civics. For their part, supporters of decision making/topical approaches believe that courses in history and the social sciences do not provide effective citizen education because they do not ensure that the academic knowledge that they provide to students gets integrated or applied to decision making about personal or civic issues.

Cherryholmes (1980) has criticized what he identifies as positivist assumptions built into the decision making model advanced by Engle (1960) and others, especially the idea that one can make decisions inductively by first collecting objective facts in an objective manner and then integrating these facts within a context provided by one's values in order to make a reasoned decision. He argues that in the social sciences, certain statements that appear to be purely factual actually contain value components; that facts and values cannot always be distinguished clearly; and that the social facts of the social sciences are fundamentally different from the brute facts of the natural sciences because they are constituted intentionally and must be interpreted within historical and cultural contexts. Consequently, he believes that social scientific criticism is a necessary condition for teaching even the basic facts of social education, let alone for teaching the critical thinking and decision making aspects of its citizen education components. Thus, although Cherryholmes joins most other social educators in favoring an emphasis on critical thinking and decision making in social studies instruction, he cautions that this needs to be accomplished within a context of classroom discourse that is informed by social criticism and designed to construct consensus concerning interpretations of social phenomena, while at the same time avoiding positivistic tendencies to inappropriately objectify social phenomena, to treat the fact/value distinction simplistically, to ignore the theoretical background of observations, or to rely on "overly inductive strategies."

Inquiry and Scientific Experimentation

One set of higher order thinking and problem solving goals that is not well accommodated by a decision making approach to social studies surrounds inquiry, at least as it was operationalized in MACOS and other social science-emphasis programs of the 1960s. In one sense, this omission is genuine and intended. Social studies educators have voiced several common complaints about the inquiry activities included in those programs (Hertzberg, 1981; Kaltsounis, 1987). One is that these inquiry activities were focused on problems that were too academic and lacking in implications for decision making and citizen action. A related complaint was that many of these problems were highly artificial, causing students to speculate about hypothetical countries or communities instead of studying real ones, and causing them to grapple with uninteresting problems formulated by someone else rather than to address personally identified problems in the manner suggested by Dewey. Other common complaints centered on cost-effectiveness issues. Many teachers questioned the value of trying to get elementary school students to function as "little social scientists" by generating and testing hypotheses in the manner of disciplinary experts, and even teachers who accepted this notion in theory usually complained that it was not feasible in practice because the activities often were bewildering to students or were too time consuming, difficult to manage, or otherwise impractical to make them worth the trouble. In particular, the data gathering aspects of many of these inquiry activities often involved a great deal of time and trouble for little apparent gain (students could understand the logic and basic procedures involved in conducting a particular type of experiment without having to perform all of the operations).

Finally, the recognition is developing that the programs of the 1960s identified the processes of science (i.e., the activities that scientists engage in) too narrowly with empirical experimentation. Anderson and Roth (in press) make this argument in the context of science education, noting that in addition to the time they spend carrying out experiments, scientists spend a great deal of time thinking about and discussing scientific theories and data and (like nonscientists) using their scientific knowledge to describe, explain, make predictions about, or exert control over real-world systems or events. They go on to argue that classroom discourse that is focused on applications of scientific knowledge for description, explanation, prediction, or control purposes is likely to be of more value than work on experiments for promoting meaningful understanding of and higher order thinking about science content. Most social educators would make the similar argument that classroom discourse that focuses on content drawn from history and the social sciences within a critical thinking or decision-making context would promote meaningful understanding and citizen education applications of the content more effectively than inquiry in the form of social science experimentation. Thus, there is little enthusiasm among social studies educators for the latter form of inquiry activities.

On the other hand, there is enthusiasm for developing in students a commitment to using rational processes for solving problems and making decisions, for teaching them the thinking and procedural skills involved in framing questions and hypotheses and gathering relevant information, and for familiarizing them with scientific logic and methods. Furthermore, curriculum guides often call for collecting survey information, taking measurements, or even conducting brief experiments. However, the emphasis is on teaching students enough about scientific methods so that they can understand them and use them (if needed) in the process of carrying out realistic decision making activities (as opposed to making inquiry both the focus and the method of instruction and having students spend a great deal of their time conducting experiments or working on relatively artificial problems).

In summary, contemporary social studies educators emphasize the _rational processes_ rather than the _operational procedures_ involved in scientific thinking, as well as the application of such scientific thinking to the resolution of personal and civic issues rather than to the generation of knowledge in the underlying disciplines. Consequently, higher order thinking in social studies is discussed more in terms of decision making and critical thinking than in terms of problem solving and inquiry.

Interpersonal Skills

Among the thinking skills identified in the NCSS essentials statement and other sources, what has been said so far covers everything except for interpersonal skills and metacognition. The interpersonal skills listed in the NCSS statement are a mixed bag. Some appear to be values rather than skills (accept responsibility and show respect for the rights and property of others, recognize value in individuals different from oneself). The others range from the extremely specific (use group generalizations without stereotyping or arbitrarily classifying individuals) to the very general (work effectively with others as a group member, see things from others' points of view). Also, most of these could just as easily have been classified as participation skills rather than thinking skills. For that reason, I will consider them in a later section on participation skills.

Metacognition

Social studies educators have not had much to say yet about cognitive strategies and metacognition, although Solomon (1987) noted the importance of teaching students to be conscious of the mental processing they use when comprehending information, solving problems, researching topics, communicating with others, or making decisions (Solomon listed these five intellectual tasks as the primary occasions for use of thinking skills in social studies). In general, though, there is every reason to believe that cognitive strategies and metacognition will be discussed with the same meanings and assigned the same importance in social studies as in other content areas. Furthermore, the emphasis in social studies on critical thinking and decision making provides a natural context for including instruction in cognitive strategies and metacognition, since critical thinking and decision making are cognitive processes calling for the kind of goals-driven strategy use for which cognitive strategies and metacognition are crucial components.

The metacognitive components of methods that have been developed to enhance students' general reading comprehension and study skills would also apply to instruction in social studies. Devine (1981), for example, suggested that students will be able to organize their notes more effectively if they are aware of the text structures (organizing schemas) used by the authors of their textbooks or other curriculum materials. Devine has identified six text structures that students are likely to encounter frequently:

1. Generalization supported by examples
2. Enumeration (of lists of items)
3. Time patterns (items or events placed into chronological order)
4. Climax patterns (items arranged from least to most important, worst to best, or smallest to largest)
5. Compare and contrast patterns
6. Cause and effect patterns

With specific regard to social studies, Armbruster and Anderson (1984) identified frames (organizing structures or schemas) that are frequently used in social studies texts. In history texts, for example, the goal frame is common. This frame has four slots: goal, plan, action, and outcome. The slots correspond to the main ideas in psychological explanations of historical events. The goal is the desired state sought by the group; the plan is their strategy for attaining the goal; the action is the behavior taken in response to the plan; and the outcome is the consequence of this action. Armbruster and Anderson suggested that students who are made aware of this goal frame should be able to read with better comprehension and to take more organized notes about historical events to which the frame is applicable (accounts of voyages of discovery, for example). They also identified a problem/solution frame (a variation of the goal frame that applies to accounts of situations in which problems arose during attempts to meet the goal), a compromise frame, and a war frame (both of the latter apply to accounts of situations in which the goals or plans of two groups are incompatible).

Hoge and Crump (1988) and Alvermann (1987) described additional frames that are frequently used in social studies texts. Alvermann also suggested ways that teachers can help their students to learn social studies content more systematically and with greater metacognitive awareness by stimulating their relevant prior knowledge and in other ways preparing them to learn, by cuing their processing of new learning through questioning, and by helping them to consolidate and extend their learning through activities and assignments that call for reflective thinking.

Cornbleth (1985) acknowledged the potential application value of cognitive research on metacognition and related topics to social studies instruction. She also cautioned, however, that the interests of cognitive researchers do not always coincide with those of social studies educators, so that it will be necessary to make sure that cognitive research findings are not applied in ways that promote teaching of cognitive and metacognitive skills divorced from discipline-based knowledge.

Participation Skills

The citizen education and personal development themes in social studies education create an emphasis on development of empathy with others, prosocial interactions in social situations, treating others with tolerance and respect, and working with others to accomplish social or civic purposes. There is a strong humanistic values aspect to these social participation and civic action components of social education, as well as a skills aspect. The NCSS essentials statements includes interpersonal skills as a subset of thinking skills as well as a category called participation skills. Thus, the implication is that these social participation skills and related cognitive strategies will be explicitly taught.

In practice, however, there is little explicit instruction in the skills or cognitive strategies involved in social participation. Instead, there is an emphasis on including in the curriculum frequent occasions for such social participation: simulations and games, discussions and debates, group projects in the classroom, and civic action projects outside the classroom. When operationalized in this way as occasions for exercise of participation skills without prior strategic instruction or subsequent strategic analysis, the participation skills aspects of the curriculum do not systematically incorporate instruction in higher order thinking.

To the extent that such instruction in social participation skills were to be included in the curriculum, it would be analyzable using the same research literatures (expert-novice comparisons, studies on cognitive strategy instruction) and the same concepts (accessibility, metacognition, etc.) as other skill and strategy instruction is. The fact that participation inherently involves interacting with other people limits its predictability and implies the need for a repertoire of skills for responding to a range of contingencies, but in principle it should be subject to the same kinds of analyses and principles as the skills and strategies used in less complex situations are.

Values

Social studies educators are virtually unanimous in stressing the importance of addressing values, not only as objects of study but as considerations to be taken into account when making decisions. There has been disagreement about how the values component of the curriculum should be handled, however, ranging from a pure inculcation approach that indoctrinates students in a fixed set of values to a pure values clarification approach in which students are made aware of the values that underlie their decisions but no attempt is made to argue that some of these values are preferable to others.

The inculcation approach has been dominant historically and by most accounts remains dominant at the classroom level, even though most scholarly leaders oppose it. Three alternative approaches have received a great deal of publicity and scholarly interest, although apparently they have enjoyed only limited implementation in classrooms. The first of these is *values clarification* (Raths, Harmin, & Simon, 1978), which tends to get lumped with secular humanism and attacked by religious and patriotic groups because it calls for teachers to limit themselves to attempts to clarify the different positions that one could take on a problem and the underlying values associated with those positions, without pushing the students toward any particular position or decision. Values clarification activities involve analysis and synthesis of information relevant to a problem or issue, so they involve higher order thinking.

The same is true of the *moral reasoning* approaches that have been developed based on the ideas of Lawrence Kohlberg (1975). Here, the teacher leads the class in discussions of hypothetical vignettes depicting moral dilemmas. Students are asked to give opinions about what actions the characters depicted in the vignettes should take, and to explain their reasoning. There are no "right answers," and the teacher's goal is to stimulate the students to develop higher levels of moral judgment (as conceptualized in Kohlberg's theory and assessed according to qualitative indicators) rather than to lead them toward a particular solution to the dilemma or toward commitment to any particular set of values.

In a review and critique of approaches to values education, Harshman and Gray (1983) note that approaches such as values clarification or moral reasoning include worthwhile elements that should be preserved, such as attempts to stimulate students to develop higher stages of thinking and to involve them actively in analysis of values and consideration of their role in decision making. They also note, however, that such approaches have been criticized by scholars for (a) focusing on hypothetical situations rather than addressing the learning of specific social behaviors in naturally occurring social contexts; (b) overemphasizing the reasoning that leads to decisions, at the expense of attempts to explain, interpret, or rationalize the decisions afterwards; and (c) failing to address society's need for citizens who are loyal to the basic social norms but also able to exercise judgment concerning responsibilities and obligations. In an attempt to address these criticisms while maintaining what is valuable in other approaches, Harshman and Gray recommend a values analysis approach that goes beyond values clarification by guiding students in examining the warrants for values themselves (not just the linkages between positions and their underlying values) and trying to decide which positions and values are most justified.

Even these authors' recommendations, however, reveal the tension that pervades discussions of the values component of social studies education: In elaborating on their recommendations, they identify one set of objectives that focuses on development of the disposition to follow the rules of conduct accepted by the culture and another set of objectives that focuses on learning to make decisions according to personal interests and intentions. Recognizing this conflict, the authors suggest that it can be resolved by encouraging students to behave in accordance with the rules of conduct accepted by the culture but always as thoughtful, goal-oriented human beings seeking to become autonomous individuals. This sounds more like a restatement of the dilemma than a solution to it.

Other "solutions" are similar. The NCSS essentials statement states that students need to learn the basic principles of our democratic constitutional order, rooted in the concepts of justice, equality, responsibility, freedom, diversity, and privacy. It also states that exemplary programs do not indoctrinate students to accept these ideas blindly, but instead present knowledge about their historical derivation and contemporary application and offer opportunities to discuss them as they relate to the curriculum and to current affairs. Similarly, Kaltsounis (1987) says that recent curricula have switched emphasis from a pure values clarification approach to a values analysis approach that includes instruction in

> the common values found in our nation's basic social contracts--the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. It is acceptable now to advocate the development of the values embodied in these documents as long as instruction that appeals to the rational process is used instead of indoctrination. (p. 16)

In summary, most social studies educators stop short of complete moral relativism and argue instead that students should be taught to make sure that their value-related decisions are consistent with core values, especially those expressed in the nation's basic social contracts. Furthermore, they tend to recommend values analysis approaches in which students not only are led to consider the values as well as the facts to be taken into account in decision making, but also are required to predict the probable consequences of their decisions and to justify them as consistent with shared core values and not just with their own narrower self-interests (Banks, 1985). These elements would be included not only in direct teaching about values but in the process of working through role play and simulation activities, decision making activities, and discussions of controversial issues.

To the extent that values are taught in ways that highlight their underlying concepts and feature analysis of the complexities surrounding moral dilemmas or controversial public issues, this teaching will involve aspects of meaningful understanding and related higher order thinking. The concept of justice, for example, is a complicated abstraction to begin with, and coming to understand how it has evolved over time, how it relates to other concepts, and how it applies to a broad range of personal and civic decision making situations is even more complicated. Thus, the concepts, generalizations, principles, and theories involved in moral or values education appear to offer the same potentials and imply the same conclusions about teaching for meaningful understanding and higher order applications as the concepts, generalizations, principles, or theories found in the social sciences.

The difference is that values education content has more direct and continuing implications for personal decision making and action than most of the content drawn from the social sciences. Furthermore, these implications have potentially strong affective components (pride and satisfaction in living up to ideals, guilt and shame for failure to do so). These affective and personal relevance aspects of values education may at times overwhelm the cognitive aspects or interact with them in ways that make the values education components of social studies qualitatively different from the components that focus on social science content.

The preceding sections of the paper constitute a review and synthesis of the statements of leading social education scholars and organizations concerning the purposes and goals of elementary social studies, especially as they concern meaningful understanding, critical thinking, decision making, and other aspects of higher order thinking. The next several sections address several more specific related issues: the degree to which a single word (such as "power") or short phrase (such as "empowering students with accessible and usable knowledge") may be useful as a shorthand or summary term for the various higher order learning outcomes that good social studies instruction would produce; what social studies educators have had to say about differentiating content or instruction according to different types of students; what they have had to say about curriculum balancing, sequencing, and integration issues; what they have had to say about differentiation of content according to grade level; and what they have had to say about assessment and evaluation of student learning. Then, in the final section of the paper, the author offers his personal responses to the material reviewed earlier in the paper and draws tentative conclusions about key features of ideal curriculum, instruction, and evaluation in elementary social studies teaching. Colleagues preparing the parallel papers on mathematics, science, literature, and the arts for Study 1 of Phase I of our research (described on page 1 of this paper) all address these same issues.

Power

The notion of power (or accessibility, competence, etc.) is applicable as a way of summing up the student outcomes that reflect the general goals of social studies education, especially if its dispositional aspects are stressed along with its knowledge and skill aspects. As exemplified in the NCSS guidelines and in the statements cited on pages 2 and 3, the general goals statements of social studies educators focus not only on accessible knowledge and skills, but also on commitment to core values and on dispositions such as a feeling of obligation to participate in social, political, and economic processes, a commitment to rational processes for gathering information and making decisions, and a tendency to behave in ways that are consistent with shared core values in addition to one's personal self-interest.

Similarly, the notion of power in applying social studies knowledge should not be limited to utilitarian applications that involve solving some well-structured problem or accomplishing some specific goal. Like science, literature, and the knowledge and appreciation aspects of the arts, but in contrast to the academic tool skills and the performance aspects of the arts, most of the content taught in social studies focuses on propositional knowledge (facts, concepts, generalizations, principles) rather than on procedural knowledge (skills, strategies, processes). Furthermore, with just a few exceptions such as information about maps and globes, the propositional knowledge learned in social studies is not linked in any direct way to particular procedural knowledge or applications. We teach about history and about world cultures, for example, not because we see this information as specific preparation for particular kinds of problem solving and decision making, but because we believe that knowledge about developments in human society and culture over time and about similarities and differences among contemporary societies and cultures is important as part of a general base of knowledge that individuals will need as a context within which to intelligibly interpret and respond to events in their lives and in the world at large.

Furthermore, occasions for applying propositional knowledge learned in social studies classes do not necessarily require problem solving or decision making. For example, in reading, participating in conversations, or listening to news reports, we frequently encounter input that can be related to our knowledge of the social studies. To the extent that we recognize and consciously consider these linkages, they become occasions for cognitive applications of a propositional knowledge. However, because they are largely serendipitous and not goal-directed, they are applications of a nonproblem-solving nature. These might be called self-actualization or appreciation applications.

One set of occasions for self-actualization applications occurs when a person reflects on input (such as news of a revolution in a third world country) by relating it to social studies concepts, comparing it to similar or contrasting events using social studies concepts or generalizations, analyzing it, and so on. To the extent that this activity involves accommodation rather than mere assimilation (in the Piagetian sense of these terms), it may lead to extension or qualification of existing knowledge. It may also involve some exercise of skills, such as if the person gets out a globe to look up the location of the country involved. In any case, to the extent that such activity is motivated by intrinsic interest or curiosity rather than because the information developed is needed for some utilitarian purpose, the incident is an example of a self-actualization application of social studies knowledge.

Other cognitive applications involve *appreciation* of social studies concepts, principles, or theories. Here the person not only engages in the kinds of cognitive activity mentioned above, but does so with intrinsic motivation and at some length, experiencing a sense of wonder, pleasure, mastery, and so forth, in the process of analyzing the situation. People who enjoy reading history and biography, following political debates, or analyzing and making predictions about emerging developments are examples of individuals who have learned to enjoy the self-actualization and appreciation applications of social knowledge.

Ideally, students will not only learn social studies content but appreciate its value for helping them to understand how the world as we know it came to be and what is occurring in it now, as well as to make personal and civic decisions. Also, students should come to appreciate their own developing understandings and insights--to enjoy and take pride in seeing how what they have learned applies to their own lives, to appreciate the development of new insights or the clarity or other aesthetic qualities of an argument they have developed, to enjoy interpreting or predicting current events, to enhance their knowledge by reading or watching programs on social issues or topics, and in general, to use what they have learned for self-actualization applications in addition to more utilitarian problem-solving applications (see Brophy, 1987, or Good & Brophy, 1987, for an approach to motivating students to learn academic content that includes consideration of these self-actualization applications).

Newmann's Research on Thoughtfulness in Social Studies Teaching

The scholarly literature in social studies is relatively rich in conceptual frameworks for describing and comparing general approaches to curriculum and instruction and the different forms of higher order thinking that are emphasized within these approaches. Unfortunately, this conceptual richness is not accompanied by a rich empirical knowledge base. Relatively few studies have been done in social studies classes, and most of these were too limited in scope to be relevant to the major issues addressed in this paper. An important exception, however, is the work of Fred Newmann and his colleagues at the National Center on Effective Secondary schools on classroom "thoughtfulness" as a means of promoting higher order thinking in high school social studies instruction.

Rather than concentrating on specific conceptions such as critical thinking, informal reasoning, or divergent thinking, Newmann (in press) has couched his research within a framework built around a single broad conception of higher order thinking in social studies. Contrasting it with lower order thinking, which demands only routine, mechanistic application of previously acquired knowledge, Newmann describes higher order thinking as challenging the student to interpret, analyze, or manipulate information in response to a question or problem that cannot be resolved through routine application of previously learned knowledge. In order to meet such higher order thinking challenges successfully, students need a combination of (a) in-depth knowledge of the content, (b) skills in processing information, and (c) attitudes or dispositions of reflectiveness.

Newmann goes on to argue that this definition of higher order thinking in social studies implies that instruction should be organized more toward depth on a few related topics than toward breadth in covering a great many topics, and that activities should encourage students to go beyond gathering information in order to participate in disciplined inquiry by scrutinizing arguments for logical consistency, distinguishing between relevant and irrelevant information and between factual claims and value judgments, using metaphor and analogy to represent problems and solutions, developing and defending positions by referring to relevant information, and making reasoned decisions. Furthermore, these activities should both develop and reflect a complex of student dispositions that together constitute "thoughtfulness": a persistent desire that claims be supported by reasons (and that the reasons themselves be scrutinized), a tendency to be reflective by taking time to think problems through rather than acting impulsively or automatically accepting the views of others, a curiosity to explore new questions, and the flexibility to entertain alternative and original solutions to problems.

Following up on his conception of higher order thinking and its implications for instruction in social studies, Newmann (1988b) has developed a set of high inference rating instruments for measuring the degree to which thoughtfulness is observed in high school social studies classes. Seventeen scales have been developed, although the key indicators of thoughtfulness appear to be the degree to which

1. Classroom interaction focuses on sustained examination of a few topics rather than superficial coverage of many
2. Such interaction is characterized by substantive coherence and continuity;
3. The students are given sufficient time to think before being required to answer questions
4. The teacher presses students to clarify or justify their assertions (rather than merely accepting and reinforcing them indiscriminately)
5. The teacher models the characteristics of a thoughtful person (showing interest in students' ideas and their suggestions for solving problems, modeling problem solving processes rather than just giving answers, acknowledging the difficulties involved in gaining a clear understanding of problematic topics)

6. Students generate original and unconventional ideas in the course of the interaction.

Early findings indicate that combination scores based on these scales distinguish classrooms that feature sustained and thoughtful teacher-student discourse about the content not only from classrooms that feature lecture, recitation, and seatwork focused on low level aspects of the content, but also from classrooms in which teachers emphasize discussion and student participation but do not foster much thoughtfulness because they skip from topic to topic too quickly or because they accept students' contributions uncritically (Newmann, 1988b).

Other noteworthy findings are that

1. Teachers whose classroom observation data show higher scores on thoughtfulness ratings also tend to make writing assignments that are more likely to require students to draw inferences, give reasons, integrate information from a number of sources, develop an idea or theme, or generate original responses

2. Thoughtfulness scores were unrelated to student achievement levels, indicating that level of classroom discourse depends much more on the teacher than on the students

3. High scoring teachers were more likely to mention critical thinking and problem solving as important goals that focused their lesson planning efforts

4. In talking about the satisfactions of teaching, high scoring teachers tended to mention evidence of good student thinking about the content, whereas low scoring teachers tended to mention evidence of student interest or positive response to the lesson (but without emphasizing good student thinking about the content)

5. In talking about goals for students, high scoring teachers were more likely to mention longer range and farther reaching dispositional goals in addition to more immediate knowledge and skill goals

6. High scoring teachers expressed more confidence than low scoring teachers that they could influence the performance of below average students

7. Both types of teachers mentioned higher order thinking tasks as examples of the kinds of tasks that students were likely to resist, but the high scoring teachers nevertheless emphasized higher order thinking tasks in their classrooms

8. Both types of teachers felt pressure to cover more content, but the high scoring teachers experienced this primarily as external pressure and tended to resist it by favoring depth over breadth, whereas the low scoring teachers experienced it primarily as internal pressure and thus tended to opt for breadth of content coverage over depth of topic development

9. Students identified the high scoring teachers' classes as more difficult and challenging, but also as more engaging and interesting.

Although developed for and implemented at the high school level where teachers tend to stress the academic disciplines, most of Newmann's ideas and research methods also appear to be applicable at the elementary level where teachers tend to stress citizen education goals. Thus, Newmann's ideas appear to be particularly rich sources of input into our Center's work, not only in social studies but also in the other subject areas. If Newmann's findings should be replicated at the elementary level, they would provide considerable cause for optimism because they would indicate that thoughtful, in-depth treatment that fosters higher order thinking about social studies topics is feasible in most classrooms (not just those dominated by high achievers), and that teachers with the knowledge and determination to do so can overcome student resistance to higher order thinking activities and even bring the students to the point where they see such activities as more engaging and interesting than more typical lower-order recitation and seatwork. Only limited research relevant to Newmann's work has been done at the elementary level, but Thornton and Wenger (1988) reported observing lessons that exhibited many of the characteristics of thoughtfulness as described by Newmann, and Stodolsky (1988) reported that the quality of students' task engagement was higher during more cognitively complex activities than during lower level activities.

Differentiation According to Different Types of Student

Except for speculating about what is appropriate for students at different grade levels (discussed in a subsequent section), social studies educators tend not to talk about differentiating the content for different students. One reason for this is that social studies educators tend to share a global and humanistic perspective that is oriented more toward the commonalities than the differences between individuals and groups. This creates a focus on strengths and celebration of contributions rather than on deficiencies or weaknesses when comparing individuals or groups. Also, most social studies content is not considered hierarchical--differences in difficulty level reside mostly in the degree of depth or elaboration with which topics are addressed rather than in differences in the topics themselves. Thus, the tendency is to teach the same content to all students in the class, rather than to introduce differentiation through within-class grouping or individualized instruction.

To the extent that teachers are urged to differentiate their instruction to different students, the emphasis is on including local issues and participation in local community affairs (in order to link the general content taught in the curriculum to the students' experiences and to local community concerns) and using a variety of methods and allowing a great deal of choice in assignments so as to accommodate student differences in interests and learning styles.

Crabtree (1983) recommended that teachers provide a wide range of multisensory experiences in varied activities that would accommodate multiple paths to learning. She argued that whole-class, text-based teaching that is "enlivened for the most part only by teacher lectures and discussion in a 'closed' recitative style" is alienating to advanced students and dysfunctional for students with learning problems such as low motivation, short attention span, memory problems, language problems, or reading deficiencies (p. 273). She suggested that teachers address these problems by assessing their students' current capabilities and preferences and accommodating by doing the following:

1. Using projects, activities, and problems relevant to students' interests and needs as the integrating focus of instruction
2. Supporting students' productive participation in these activities by using a variety of simpler reading materials and illustrated reading resources to supplement the basic text
3. Supplying taped editions of class texts and other materials at listening centers in the classrooms
4. Using a variety of visual and other media resources available in viewing centers in the classroom
5. Using structured role playing, simulations, and a variety of hands-on manipulatives as well as firsthand community resources

She cited research by Curtis and Shaver as evidence that social studies instruction modified in these ways could have positive effects on a variety of cognitive and affective outcomes in slow learning students.

Ochoa and Shuster (1980) offered similar suggestions for teachers in mainstreamed classrooms. Separately for each of seven types of handicapped students, they presented guidelines and sample lesson plans based on the goal of applying the same instructional objectives as much as possible to handicapped students as to other students, but tailoring instructional strategies as needed to enable the handicapped students to achieve those objectives.

Special material has been developed focusing on blacks, women, or other groups or topics that have been underrepresented in the traditional curriculum, but the approach favored by leaders in the field is to adjust the curriculum for _all_ students by incorporating new topics or content emphases into the existing structure, increasing the attention given to traditionally underrepresented groups and topics, and so on. In general, social studies educators tend to bridle at anything that smacks of elitism or separatism.

Balance, Sequencing, and Integration Issues

Most of this has already been covered in previous sections. Clearly, because of competition from the different disciplines for space in the curriculum, competition among the five approaches described by Martorella (1985) for emphasis, and the constant pressure to include new content, balance and integration issues are endemic in the social studies. Contemporary criticisms of previous eras tend to emphasize lack of balance: Early approaches were too narrowly focused on inculcation and facts, the "new social studies" programs of the 1960s were too narrowly focused on inquiry activities and the then-current ideas about the structures of the disciplines, and the curricula that replaced them in the late 1960s and early 1970s were too narrowly focused on life adjustment and then-current controversial issues. Contemporary scholars often claim that 1980s curricula have preserved the best of these various approaches and achieved balance, and the NCSS guidelines support inclusion of a variety of content and approaches to instruction (although leaving it to individual schools to decide what the particular balance among these elements should be). However, these guidelines appear to try to please everyone by mentioning everything, so that they come off as overwhelming or as pie in the sky that cannot be achieved in reality. The same is true of the guidelines of the Michigan State Board of Education (1987) concerning essential goals and objectives for the social studies.

The latter guidelines are ideal in many respects. They subdivide goals and objectives for K-3, 4-6, 7-9, and 10-12; include attention to knowledge, values, skills, and social participation; specify whether topics should be merely introduced, systematically developed, or reinforced (elaborated and applied) at each level; convey a strong citizenship education flavor but with clear emphasis on analysis and critical thinking over simple indoctrination; follow the expanding communities model but with emphasis on discipline-based powerful ideas in outlining the content; phrase subgoals primarily in terms of understanding; and include content drawn from psychology and sociology along with the more traditional social studies disciplines. However, they are overwhelming in length and variety, yet much less prescriptive than they appear to be at first. Thus, curricula that met these guidelines probably would be better than curricula that did not, but many different kinds of curricula could meet the guidelines. Given the multidisciplinary nature of the social studies and their emphasis on citizen education goals in addition to social science content goals, perhaps this is as much as can be expected, and progress will be achieved more by assembling detailed descriptions of what good programs look like (as we will be trying to do in our research) than by developing tighter curriculum guidelines.

In any case, it is clear that worthwhile higher order thinking goals can be pursued successfully using content drawn from history or any of the social sciences, regardless of whether the content is approached with primary emphasis on disciplinary knowledge, personal life adjustment, or citizen education. It also seems likely that similar principles will apply across these approaches to the social studies in determining what makes for success in addressing particular higher order thinking goals (although the time spent on different kinds of higher order thinking goals will vary according to the program's emphasis).

Differentiation of Content According to Grade Level

Social studies educators believe that, with the possible exception of aspects of geography and economics, the content is not inherently hierarchical and does not need to be taught in any particular sequence. Difficulty levels reside in the levels of depth and sophistication with which topics are addressed, rather than in the topics themselves. Difficulty levels increase as one moves from the concrete to the abstract, from easily observable facts relating to familiar situations to facts about phenomena less rooted in experience, and from an emphasis on facts to an emphasis on concepts, generalizations, principles, and theories.

Concepts differ among themselves in level of difficulty (Armento, 1986). Concepts with straightforward definitions or structures and observable and clear illustrations are easier to learn than concepts with "if-then" or relational structures. Thus, the concepts of goods, services, producers, and consumers are simpler economic concepts to learn than cost, scarcity, or comparative advantage. Subordinate and coordinate concepts are easier to learn than superordinate and relational concepts.

Fair (1977) suggested the following generalizations about the difficulty level of social studies content:

1. The sheer quantity of things to be dealt with simultaneously makes for increased difficulty level (it is harder to compare or interpret three things than two things)
2. More abstract content is more difficult than less abstract content
3. Fine distinctions are more difficult than gross ones
4. Relying solely on print as the source for input makes for greater difficulty than using a multimedia approach
5. It is easier to develop skills in thinking about matters that students see as closely related to their own lives than about other matters
6. Providing structure, cues, and props makes thinking easier

This emphasis on content rooted in the students' life experiences is one reason why social studies educators have come to accept the expanding communities curriculum structure for the elementary grades. Also, because the primary grades within this structure tend to concentrate on universal human experiences occurring within families and local communities, the content tends to draw heavily from psychology, sociology, and anthropology. The focus shifts to geography, economics, civics, and history in the middle grades as students begin to study states and nations of the past and present and to address some of the more conceptual and abstract aspects of the content.

Like Fair, Crabtree (1983) argued that developmental considerations are critical to the social studies. She suggested that the scope of learning incorporated into social studies programs should be made expansive across at least four dimensions by simultaneously moving students (a) spatially from here to far away; (b) temporally from now to times past; (c) interculturally from the familiar to the unfamiliar; and (d) systematically from the first interactions of young children within the social system of the family to increasingly complex understandings of the social, economic, and political systems in their many interactions and linkages. Within these general trends, particular topics would be taken up at times that students appear to be optimally ready to engage them, and individual differences in readiness would be accommodated by varying the amount and nature of instructional assistance and activities. She argued that meaningful understanding of concepts and principles as well as critical thinking, decision making, and other higher order applications can be accomplished even in the primary grades, so long as instruction focuses on "micro issues" rooted in the everyday lives of children rather than "macro issues" that would require them to analyze major social, economic, or political events that transcend their experience base or the scope of their cognitive understandings. She also suggested that the childhood years are particularly important for developing core values and beliefs.

The idea that social studies involves abstractions that are not well grasped until at least the fourth grade has caused some to argue that social studies instruction should not begin until that time, and many to argue that history should not be taught until the secondary grades. However, McKenzie (1986) argued that these pessimistic notions about what can or should be taught in the elementary grades are based on early Piagetian claims that have since been disproven. He further argued that modern information processing and schema theories indicate that children must learn stories, information, and ideas of precisely the sort that are included in history and the social sciences before they can comprehend sketchy statements that they hear or read each day and before they can solve problems through logical reasoning. For example, the phrase "separatists faced many difficulties" is likely to be relatively meaningless to young children, but it takes on meaning when the term "pilgrims" is substituted for "separatists." Similarly, references to American traditions or to the intentions of the framers of the Constitution are relatively meaningless to children unless they can bring to bear relevant knowledge of the events that led to the Declaration of Independence and affected the thinking of the framers of the Constitution. Thus, McKenzie argued that besides its inherent value as citizenship training, social studies is "basic" in that it provides information and ideas about people, places, and events that children must know if they are to comprehend the meanings of sketchy news reports or brief paragraphs such as those that occur on reading comprehension tests. McKenzie's ideas illustrate both the arguments that social studies educators offer in support of the suitability of abstract content in the early grades and the felt need of social studies educators to defend the importance of their subject against "back to basics" pressures.

Elkind (1981) pointed out that even Piaget spoke of "anticipations"--intuitive ideas and interests that children develop that will only become fully elaborated at a later stage. In respect to history, for example, children have an intuitive sense of the past and a spontaneous interest in it that can provide a basis for instruction. Elkind went on to argue, however, that such instruction is likely to be effective only if it gets to the operative level rooted in students' concrete experiences, such as by having the children investigate their own family histories, explore the geography of the neighborhood, or examine cultural artifacts. If the information stays at a purely figurative level (Indians wear headbands, Mexicans wear sombreros, etc.), it will not have much meaning or much likelihood of being included in permanent and powerful networks of social studies principles and concepts. Similarly, Marshall (1985) argued that even in the primary grades children can benefit from instruction in history if the material is presented primarily in the form of vivid narratives about real people rather than abstractions, and if it is organized around concepts such as courage, cowardice, oppression, resentment, victory, and defeat that children experience in their own lives.

Levstik (1986) discussed these issues at length. Taking issue with the notion that history should not be taught in the early grades because historical thinking develops slowly and requires formal operations, Levstik developed the following argument. First, the logical structures that underlie science and mathematics may not have direct analogues in history. History is particularistic, and historians seek explanations for specific events rather than general laws. Furthermore, they develop arguments in support of personal interpretations rather than seeking to establish what is objectively true through logical analysis. Thus, Kohlberg's stage model of moral judgment may be a better model for the development of thinking relevant to history than Piaget's stage model of the development of logical-mathematical structures.

Parallels between children's response to historical material and their developing sense of story and response to literature also provide reasons for optimism about teaching history in the primary grades. During the years when social studies emphasize the here and now, children's literary interests involve the distant and fantastic of adventures, fairy tales, and so on. In short, children can understand abstract or unfamiliar content if it is placed into a narrative framework and that deals with motives or thoughts that they can understand and identify with. Thus, perhaps we should analyze the development of historical understandings less in terms of scientific logic than in terms of proceeding from subjective involvement in stories of individual lives toward a more mature level of historical objectivity. If so, providing opportunities for children to encounter history in a subjective context (narrative) that engages their emotions as well as their intellect should be an effective way to teach them history, or at least to introduce them to it. The development of historical thinking then would involve gradual progression from history of low validity (based on oversimplified stories centered around heroes) to history of high validity, but with the first as a necessary precursor to the second.

Kieran Egan (1979, 1982) has been a leading advocate of the idea of building early history instruction around narratives that combine historical incidents with emotion, conflict, and the participant's view of events. Egan rejected the notion that the Piagetian concept of decalage adequately explains the variation in levels of thinking that children exhibit in different content areas and argued instead that some thinking simply does not fit into the developmental constructs of Piaget. He has offered his own theory of stages in the development of historical thinking and has argued the importance of narrative approaches in the early grades to build a foundation for more formal historical instruction in later grades.

Similar arguments have been advanced concerning whether and how values should be taught in the social studies curriculum. Many believe that values analysis is inherently abstract and should be withheld until ages 11 or 12, and that earlier grade levels should be devoted to teaching core values and noncontroversial behavioral norms. Others argue that children can profit from and should be exposed to values analysis focused on familiar situations, behaviors, and intentions. The former group tends to emphasize inculcation, and the latter group tends to emphasize decision making (but with justification of decisions based on their congruence with core values).

In conclusion, controversy about what to include in the elementary grades curriculum continues among social studies educators, although its focus has shifted over the years. Claims based on skill hierarchy notions or Piagetian stage notions have receded in favor of the idea that the difficulty level of content resides primarily in the manner and depth with which it is approached rather than in the topics addressed, as well as the notion that instruction in any particular domain should begin with the familiar and concrete before moving to the strange and abstract. In addition, the emphasis has shifted from teaching content as it is structured within the disciplines or teaching other ideas that are recognized as both powerful and basic from an adult perspective toward teaching content that is meaningful (in an operative, not just a figurative sense) because it can be linked to students' social experiences, especially content that they find interesting because it engages their emotions or provides opportunity for identification with key persons in a narrative. Current arguments center less on what is possible to teach in the early grades than on what is worthwhile, why it is more worthwhile than alternatives, and how it can be taught effectively. While disagreeing about remedies, most contemporary scholars agree that not enough content is included in popularly used curriculum series for the primary grades (K-3), and that much of the content that is included is unnecessary because children already know it (Shaver,1987). Some would counter the latter point by arguing that children's knowledge of families, community helpers, and so on, although present, is overly global and intuitive, so that there is value in making it more explicit.

Assessment and Evaluation in Social Studies

The NCSS curriculum guidelines call for systematic and rigorous evaluation of social studies instruction that would (a) be based primarily on the school's own statements of objectives as the criteria for effectiveness; (b) include assessment of progress not only in knowledge, but in skills and abilities including thinking, valuing, and social participation; (c) include data from many sources, not just paper-and-pencil tests; and (d) be used for assessing students' progress in learning and for planning curriculum improvements, not just for grading. Unfortunately, there is little evidence that these guidelines are being followed widely in the classrooms.

Although standardized tests of social studies achievement exist, they tend to focus on skills rather than concepts because there is so much variation in content covered. For the same reason, these standardized tests are not used nearly as much as standardized tests of basic skills, and most evaluation is accomplished through criterion-referenced tests supplied by the curriculum publishers or tests made up by the teachers themselves. Publishers' and teachers' tests tend not to address higher order thinking, as shown in a study by Popenfus and Paradise (1978). These investigators collected teacher-made test items from 10th-, 11th-, and 12th-grade social studies teachers in several different states in the east and midwest, and analyzed 300 items at each of the three grade levels according to the Bloom taxonomy categories. Even though these were senior high school teachers, the vast majority of the items were confined to the knowledge level. Only 10% measured comprehension and application objectives, and less than 1% called for analysis, synthesis, or evaluation.

Even tests of presumably higher level abilities such as critical thinking, whether teacher-made or standardized, leave much to be desired because they tend to be confined to items calling for recognition or relatively low-level and isolated application of subskills rather than holistic application of the larger skills. Thus, students might be asked whether a statement is a fact or an opinion or asked to indicate whether a syllogism is logically valid or not, but they are unlikely to be presented with an extended argument or debate and asked to write an essay critically examining the material. In short, to the extent that tests address abilities such as critical thinking or decision making at all, they tend to address only the subskills involved and not to require students to demonstrate these abilities holistically under realistic application conditions.

Summarizing what is known about evaluation in the social studies, Kurfman (1982) concluded that teacher-made tests predominate over tests that come with curricula and over norm-referenced tests, that objective tests are more common than essay tests (especially with low-ability students), that items concentrate on knowledge and skills with little attention to affective outcomes, and that social studies teachers are not sophisticated about evaluation, do not like to engage in it, and are uninventive in doing so (tests or quizzes occur at least once a week in only 20% of K-3 classes and 38% of 4-6 classes).

This assessment is an accurate description of the current situation, but it seems to take for granted that there should be a heavy emphasis on evaluation in social education. An alternative view is that in addition to considering what to evaluate and how to do it well, we also need to consider how much and what kind of evaluation should occur in social studies in the first place, working from the assumption that there is an optimal level and type of evaluation (rather than the assumption that more is better). Given that evaluation takes time, creates anxiety, and may undermine intrinsic motivation, and given that higher order thinking usually must be evaluated in terms of qualitative criteria rather than achievement of correct answers, it is just as important to avoid too much or the wrong kind of evaluation as it is to ensure that the right amount and kinds of evaluation are included. From this perspective, especially in the early grades, evaluation focused on the teacher and the curriculum (i.e., evaluation designed to assess the degree to which the program makes sense and is effective in achieving its stated goals with the class as a whole) becomes at least as important as evaluation focused on individual students' achievement.

Newmann (1988a) suggests that assessment in social studies courses should put less emphasis on testing of isolated bits of knowledge and more emphasis on assessment of oral and written discourse that students produce with the intention of providing a narrative, argument, explanation, or analysis of a particular topic. He gives examples of questions that would require students to produce and integrate contextualized knowledge of social studies content, especially questions that would elicit authentic discourse that implies mutual interest between the responder/writer and the questioner/reader in the content of what is communicated (as opposed to a more narrow teacher interest in right answers as a basis for grading). Newmann recommends such assessment of discourse not only for individual teachers concerned with student grading and with assessment of their own relative success in moving the class toward instructional goals, but also for larger district-, state-, and national-level assessments. In this regard, he argues that scorers can be trained to grade lengthy essay responses with high validity and reliability, and that the total time needed to develop and score such tests would be no greater than the total time needed to develop and score soundly designed multiple choice tests.

Responses and Personal Conclusions

The preceding sections of this paper present a synthesis of what I have learned through reviewing the literature on curriculum, instruction, and evaluation in social studies, with emphasis on what has been said about teaching for meaningful understanding and higher order applications of the content. In the remainder of the paper, I present my personal reactions to this material in the form of tentative conclusions about key features of good social studies programs. I underscore the term "tentative" here for three reasons. First, except for this literature review and synthesis, I have yet to study these issues personally in the classroom. My academic background is in developmental and educational psychology rather than in curriculum and instruction, and although I have studied teacher expectations and attitudes, the dynamics of teacher-student relationships, classroom management, student motivation, and relatively generic process-outcome relationships linking teacher behavior to student achievement, I have not yet focused in any systematic way on curriculum, instruction, and evaluation issues within particular subject matter areas. Second, this literature review and synthesis effort has been just the beginning of a projected five-year program of research on key features of good curriculum, instruction, and evaluation in social studies (to be conducted as part of the research agenda of the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects). The conclusions summarized below will serve as tentative hypotheses to be evaluated in that research (which will include detailed interviewing and observation of teachers, followed by development and testing of guidelines for improved practice). Undoubtedly, they will be qualified and elaborated as that research progresses. Third, the literature reviewed has been mostly theoretical rather than empirical. There is very little research linking particular curriculum, instruction, or evaluation practices to measured student outcomes, let alone systematic testing of theoretically optimal programs against plausible alternatives.

Nature and Purposes of the Social Studies

I agree with most of the views on the nature and purpose of the social studies expressed in the NCSS guidelines and in the leading textbooks and journals in social education. In particular, I accept the idea that elementary level social studies should be an interdisciplinary subject that is informed by the social sciences but concerned with citizen education and life adjustment goals in addition to more narrowly construed social science goals. Especially in the primary grades, I think that an interdisciplinary focus on topics or issues makes good sense. Courses in history and geography are more appropriate for the intermediate grades, but even here, I would want the content to be selected and taught with emphasis on citizen education goals rather than on creating survey courses to introduce students to the disciplines (i.e., instead of focusing mostly on generalizations about interactions between physical environments and human behavior, instruction in geography would emphasize the social, economic, and political aspects of life in particular regions or nations, comparing these with parallels in the United States and attempting to explain the similarities and differences, in order to give students some understanding of current issues and the reasons for them; similarly, instruction in history would place less emphasis on chronology per se than on explaining the development of key ideas and practices that have shaped the modern world, so as to provide students with some understanding of how things got to be the way they are).

I also accept the notion that the social studies should seriously undertake to develop values and dispositions in addition to knowledge and skills. These would include appreciation and self-actualization values and dispositions in addition to those typically stressed by social educators (belief in core democratic values and dispositions to think critically about social and civic issues and to participate actively in civic affairs).

I believe that there should be a strong skills component to social studies instruction, although I would like to see such skills instruction integrated much more systematically with instruction in the knowledge components of the program rather than treated essentially as a separate curriculum (which is typical of current practice). The most important skills included in social studies instruction tend to be cognitive heuristics and strategies that are accessed and regulated via dispositional and metacognitive mechanisms, not mere behavioral algorithms. Some of these are strategies for processing, organizing, remembering, and retrieving information; others are critical thinking and reasoning skills used in assessing information and making decisions; and still others are paradigms and self-regulatory mechanisms used in systematic inquiry, problem solving, or decision making. As with reading comprehension strategies and study skills, I see some value in a certain amount of direct instruction in the cognitive strategies used in social studies courses, designed to ensure that students know about these strategies, understand when and why they are useful, and get some guided practice in applying them. However, these strategies would be taught as means for learning and applying social studies content, not as ends in themselves. There would be relatively little isolated skills practice, but a great deal of strategic application of these skills during classroom discourse focused on the knowledge components of the curriculum and during follow-up activities that provided students with opportunities to apply this knowledge within critical thinking, decision making, and social participation contexts.

I believe that a good social studies program would include all five of the emphases described by Martorella (1985), although in different proportions at different grade levels and for different topics. In particular, I would favor relatively more emphasis on transmission of the cultural heritage and on personal development in the primary grades, but relatively more emphasis on teaching social studies as social science and as reflective inquiry in the intermediate grades. Social criticism elements would be included at each grade, although they would evolve from narrative and personalized approaches in the early grades (focusing on the competing agendas and motives behind the policies advocated by key figures in history, for example) toward a more formal and "macro" treatment in the intermediate grades (e.g., teaching the students to routinely consider the probable effects of a proposed policy or practice on various stakeholders, besides considering the advantages claimed by its advocates as reasons to support it, as part of their critical thinking about social issues).

In general, I want students to learn how things are in the world today, how they got that way, why they are the way they are, and what implications all of this holds for personal decision making and action. Thus, I would look first to personal adjustment and citizen action concerns (adaptation based on operative knowledge of principles and generalizations) and only secondarily to the ways that knowledge is structured in the disciplines (understanding based on figurative knowledge of concepts) in seeking to identify the most powerful ideas around which to structure curricula. I also would be willing to temporarily settle for discipline-based knowledge of limited validity if I saw this as useful as far as it went (either in its own right or as an empowering prerequisite to some larger goal) and if I were convinced that the development of a more complete and valid network of knowledge was either not possible or not cost-effective (in terms of time and trouble) at the grade level.

I am more confident about how the content included in the curriculum should be treated than about what specific content should be included. The most common current approach (emphasis on psychology, sociology, anthropology, and rudimentary economics and civics in the primary grades; emphasis on history, geography, and civics in the middle grades; courses in history, government, and the social sciences thereafter) makes sense to me, but I am aware that a case can be made for inclusion of a great deal of content drawn from the disciplines that is not taught frequently now, as well as for inclusion of other content that might be considered important for life adjustment or citizen education goals. I also tend to agree with most of the claims and examples advanced by apologists for particular disciplines or special topics that more *can* be taught to young children about these disciplines or topics, but whether it should be taught is another question.

To use terms favored by social studies educators, I believe that most of these content issues cannot be resolved through the problem solving paradigm but instead require the decision making paradigm--scientific information can help us to assess the relative effectiveness of different approaches to accomplishing a particular goal, but decisions about what goals to pursue in what order of priority must be informed by values as well as by information. For example, as a person trained in clinical and developmental psychology, I am aware of discipline-based content (concerning personal adjustment, moral development, child rearing, etc.) that I think is extremely important and should be taught to all students, but others who want to emphasize the civic rather than the personal aspects of citizen education would tend to oppose including this content in the social studies curriculum. Even if scientific data were available on the short- and long-term outcomes and trade-offs to be expected from exposing students to the two different kinds of social studies programs that might emerge from these different points of view, arguments about their relative merits would be waged not only on the basis of this scientific information but also on the basis of opinions on larger issues surrounding views of the ideal person, the ideal citizen, the proper roles of the school versus the family in developing values, and so on.

I am not arguing that teaching about self-concept, personal adjustment, moral development, or other content drawn primarily from psychology should necessarily be taught within the social studies curriculum. This content could just as well be included with content relating to health, safety, and other matters within a separate curriculum that might be called something like "health and guidance." I do think that such content is valuable and should be included somewhere in the curriculum, however.

Curriculum Organization and Content Issues

I believe that, once decisions are made about general purposes and goals of social education, it is important to use as a starting place and build on students' naturally-developed and age/stage-related knowledge and interests. The expanding communities approach to curriculum organization is one way of doing this, and it has important strengths as evidenced by its durability over the last 50 years and its adaptability to continuing pressures on the social studies curriculum to absorb new topics or change its method of addressing older ones. It may well weather the current criticisms and continue as the "locally accepted national curriculum," especially if its proponents succeed in expanding and improving the content currently taught in the primary grades that is so frequently criticized as limited, trite, redundant, or simply unnecessary. Publishers could relatively easily stick with the same general scope and sequence of topics that are now taught in the primary grades but improve the content considerably by, for example, replacing trite coverage of "community helpers" such as postal workers or fire fighters with more substantive information about how the postal system handles mail and how fire departments fight fires.

On the other hand, there is nothing inherently necessary about the scope and sequence of topics typically included within expanding communities curricula. We have come to see that although Piaget's cautions against getting too far away from children's experience base to the point of trying to teach them abstractions that will yield "merely verbal" learning are well taken, Piaget's ideas about what children are capable of learning at particular ages were too pessimistic and too focused on the learning of logical-mathematical structures through self-initiated exploration of the physical environment. Current theory and research, as represented by neo-Vygotskian ideas about teaching in the zone of proximal development, indicate that children can learn a great many things earlier and more thoroughly if guided by systematic instruction than they would learn on their own. Similarly, stimulated by contemporary information processing and schema development theories, we have come to see how children can use situational schemas built up through prior knowledge and experience as templates for understanding information about how people in other times and places (including fictional characters) have responded to parallel situations. Thus, there is no need to start with the child in the here and now and move linearly backwards in time (for history instruction) or outwards in physical space and scope of community (as in the treatment of civics and geography within the expanding communities framework). Children can understand historical episodes described in narrative form with emphasis on the goals and motives of key individuals, and they can understand aspects of customs, culture, economics, and politics that focus on universal human experiences or adaptation problems that are familiar to them and for which they have developed schemas or routines.

Thus, proposals calling for replacing most of the current primary grades social studies curriculum with a curriculum that would emphasize history and related literature are certainly feasible from the perspective of developmental and educational psychology, probably just as much so as the expanding communities approach. It should be noted, however, that the same is true of other reform suggestions, such as those calling for comparative study of world cultures and customs (focusing on anthropology rather than on history) or for discussion of issues and problems (focusing on current environmental and social issues) as the basis for social studies instruction in the primary grades. Thus, differences in points of view about the nature and purposes of social studies (e.g., the five emphases described by Martorella) and about the relative value of the different disciplines as sources for content will remain unresolved even if the expanding communities framework should be discontinued.

In any case, if the reductions in time allocated to social studies (and science) instruction in the early grades that occurred as part of the "back to basics" movement should be reversed in response to current concerns about deficiencies in students' content knowledge, there will be room for expansion and improvement of the content taught in the elementary social studies curriculum, especially in the primary grades. Even most of those who would like to retain the expanding communities structure would probably agree that the content on families, neighborhoods, and communities that is presently spread over the first three grades could be covered adequately (even if made more substantive and improved in other ways) in just two grades. There also appears to be a lot of unnecessary redundancy in what is taught in grade four on geographic regions and in grade six on world cultures/hemispheres. Thus, there is room for more content, whether it be additional or more detailed history, more cross-cultural comparisons of family life and economic/political activities, or discussions of current environmental and social issues.

One suggestion that occurs to me that would combine most of these elements is an interdisciplinary course on the 20th century. Currently, elementary American history courses often stop at about 1910, and classes often do not get to the end of the book in any case. Also, cultural comparisons tend to focus on the family and social activities of cultural groups rather than on the political and economic relationships among nations, and geographical treatments tend to emphasize relationships between natural resources and economic activity within regions or nations, without much coverage of political and economic relationships between them. A 20th century course that emphasized developments in industrialization, technology, communications, and political philosophy that have shaped the contrasting developments of and shifting relationships among nations since the first world war would be of great value in filling the gaps in children's historical and geographical knowledge that are currently of such great concern, especially if it included attention to the world's recent "hot spots" and the reasons for the conflicts occurring there.

Whatever content is taught, information about what the students already know (or think they know) about a topic should be taken into account in developing the curriculum. The goal would not be to teach the disciplines themselves or even networks of knowledge organized around concepts and principles seen as being the most fundamental or powerful from an expert's perspective, but instead to draw on discipline-based knowledge and any other relevant sources to address particular topics (families, farming, Mexico, etc.) in systematic ways that enable students to (a) articulate and organize their existing implicit knowledge on the topic; (b) gain perspective by being able to place what they know about the topic within larger frames of reference (coming to distinguish universal and necessary aspects from variable and accidental aspects, learning about alternatives to the familiar and about the degree to which the familiar is typical or atypical from a global and historical perspective); and (c) structure much of what they learn around important concepts, principles, generalizations, or disposition/cognitive strategy combinations that maximize their capacity to understand and respond effectively to their social experience.

The conceptual change teaching approach that has been developed for teaching science (Anderson & Roth, in press; Anderson & Smith, 1987) is also useful for teaching social studies, because students have misconceptions about social phenomena just as they do about natural phenomena. For example, most young children implicitly view the President of the United States as being much more autonomous and powerful (able to solve just about any problem by issuing directives and seeing them carried out), altruistically motivated, and knowledgeable and concerned about the problems of individuals than any president could ever be. These notions of the president as a benevolent godlike figure are gradually replaced with more realistic ideas over a period of several years.

Children's misconceptions about social phenomena may be easier to correct than their misconceptions about natural phenomena because they tend to be implicit expectations based on oversimplified notions of good versus evil or the omnipotence and benevolence of authority figures rather than explicit beliefs based on personal observations. Having "seen" the sun circling the earth, children may not immediately accept scientific knowledge that the earth revolves around the sun. However, the same children may more readily accept information that the president is considerably less omnipotent than they had believed, because their belief was a vague assumption rather than a clear conviction developed through personal experience. Thus, teachers may not have to go to quite the same lengths in confronting and correcting misconceptions when teaching social studies as when teaching science.

Still, two points about student misconceptions should be kept in mind when developing social studies curricula. First, where it is known that many children harbor a particular misconception about a topic, instruction on the topic should be designed to include direct confrontation and correction of that misconception (in addition to good presentation of the correct information). The conceptual research on science teaching has shown that students often do not even become aware of conflict between their currently held misconceptions and the scientifically correct conceptions being taught in the curriculum unless these conflicts are confronted directly and the misconceptions are corrected by contrasting them with the correct conceptions. There is every reason to believe that the same will be true in teaching social studies, so that curricula should be developed so as not only to explicate key concepts clearly but also to contrast these key concepts with anticipated misconceptions.

Second, besides taking steps to correct known misconceptions, I believe that curriculum developers should avoid including content that would create or reinforce such misconceptions. I support efforts to develop children's commitment to democratic values, but not "citizenship training" that would be described more accurately as inculcation via propaganda than as critical thinking and decision making based on sound information. I support efforts to make schooling interesting and enjoyable for children and to avoid threatening their security by overdwelling on harsh realities (Nicaragua, the homeless, etc.) or anxiety-producing topics (AIDS, nuclear confrontation), but not to the extent of patronizing them with unnecessarily sanitized curricula or oversimplified and one-sided interpretations of complex phenomena.

Finally, I agree with Ravitch (1987) that well-chosen biographies and engaging accounts of historical events can make the study of history more concrete and interesting to elementary students; however, I do not share her enthusiasm for infusing myth and lore into the curriculum as well (if this is taken to mean the social studies curriculum). There is value in studying myth and lore as literature (i.e., within the language arts curriculum). Even within the social studies curriculum, it can be useful to include myth and lore as part of cultural studies. However, I question the wisdom of doing so with students in the primary grades, who can appreciate physical artifacts and customs but are not yet ready for systematic study of the philosophical and psychological aspects of cultures. Also, to the extent that myth and lore are included in the social studies curriculum, it is important to be sure that, as Ravitch intends, they are presented as fictions that tell us something about the culture under study.

If used for other, less defensible, purposes, and especially if presented as historical truth, myth and lore could have counterproductive effects on children's developing social knowledge. For example, stories about Paul Bunyan or Pecos Bill might be interesting to children, and the story of George Washington and the cherry tree might be a convenient fiction to use when teaching them about honesty, but (a) these are known fictions, not accounts of actual historical events; (b) at a time when children are struggling to establish concrete operations and distinguish what is true and continuing in the world from what is false or fleeting, an emphasis on myth and lore might delay or confuse their efforts to construct a reality-based model of the world; (c) to the extent that myth, lore, and other fictions are infused into the curriculum, students may begin to question the credibility of teachers or of social studies as a school subject; and (d) in any case, most of the content of myth and lore and the reasons for its development in the first place reflect the thematic preoccupations and entertainment needs of premodern agrarian societies and thus were passe even 50 years ago, let alone today.

I would favor relatively conventional coverage of history, civics, and economics as they apply to American traditions, but elaboration and follow-up activities would include attention to the issues raised by social critics and to applications to current events (especially controversial issues) and to personal and civic decision making. To an extent, I would emphasize cultural ideals and models in the early grades and phase in harsh realities and failures only gradually. I would emphasize identification with the nation and the local community (and to a lesser extent the state or region), but within a global and historical perspective and an emphasis on objective understanding rather than chauvinism. The notion that our institutions need monitoring and improvement would be a pervasive given.

I would focus more on decision making than problem solving (in the sense of discipline-based inquiry activities), and more on deliberate instruction in and application of principles and strategies than on generation of knowledge through discovery or experimentation (although I would want students to learn the rudiments of scientific methods). I would attempt to integrate skills practice and application within the teaching of propositional knowledge to the extent that this appeared to make sense, and I would teach skills within meaningful application (decision making/problem solving) contexts and with simple but clear explanations of their roles and uses. More generally, I would want to make sure that everything in the curriculum was included for good reasons and that these reasons would be communicated to students along with the knowledge and skills themselves.

Rather than give shallow coverage to everything within a domain of knowledge, I would stress major principles and generalizations and focus in depth on a few examples chosen either because they were prototypic representations of important principles and generalizations or because they provided a good contrast to the examples that students in the United States are most likely to be familiar with. In studying a country's history, for example, I would emphasize the basic economic, social, or political forces that have shaped its development (not just a chronology of noteworthy events), linking these to discipline-based concepts, generalizations, or principles (such as colonization or modernization). Similarly, in addressing its geography I would stress the relationships between its climate and natural resources, its economy, and its location and power vis-a-vis other countries as determinants of its past history and current status, not just descriptive and statistical facts.

The key ideas around which the curriculum would be built would be phrased in terms of midrange, causal principles or generalizations (see Prawat, 1988 on this point). Thus, a generalization such as "people in different places live in many different kinds of homes, depending in part on the climate and the availability of construction materials" would be preferable to the relatively trite "people live in many different kinds of homes." Unfortunately, the latter generalization is more typical of the key ideas stressed in the curricula used in the schools (or at least, the way that these ideas are conveyed to teachers). In elaborating on the key ideas, I would want to make sure that enough facts were included and that associated skills practice and application opportunities were provided. I would want to include representative examples, familiar examples, and unusual examples, but to make sure that students got a sense of what is typical and where the examples most familiar to them stood within the range of variation. Presentation would concentrate on developing understanding of cause and effect or other processes that reflect the operation of principles or generalizations. I would want to avoid covering too many facts, emphasizing cute or interesting but ultimately pointless facts, or getting lost in the definitional semantics surrounding inherently fuzzy concepts.

I would want to exemplify social science concepts in terms of familiar personal or family motives, goals, and actions. Literature might be helpful here. For history, I would want to stress the development and evolution of ideas and practices, not just chronology, and to do so in ways that personalized and concretized the material for young students.

I would be open to inclusion of facts that lay somewhat outside of these networks built around key generalizations, if a convincing case could be made that such facts should be learned because they are important in their own right or because any educated citizen will need to know them because they are frequent allusions or terms of reference in the culture. I would not carry this to the extent that E. D. Hirsch would like to, however, let alone to the extent that Washburne and others would have required when they unearthed over 80,000 such terms and facts in a project done over 50 years ago.

Instructional Methods and Activities

I would expect the teacher to spend a great deal of time actively instructing the students during whole-class activities (primarily via guided discussion rather than extended lecturing) and monitoring their progress on small group or individualized follow-up activities or assignments. The students would get input from a variety of sources (primarily reading the text and listening to teacher presentations of content, but also from films or TV, collecting data on their own, reading source materials, and so on). Rather than moving directly from input to practice or application, however, I would expect to see elaboration on the content accomplished through teacher-student discourse designed to connect concepts to one another and to the students' experience, probe the limits and implications of the content, get the students to recognize and apply generalizations, and so on. The teacher would help students to process information through advance organizers, goals statements, or reading and study guides built around key concepts and questions that would focus their efforts and make them goals-driven. During teacher-student interaction, the teacher would elaborate on this by giving explanations using prototypical examples and cases and probing for additional examples and limits of the concepts, comparisons and contrasts, and predictions to new cases. Students would be socialized to understand that teacher-student dialogue is needed to elaborate and interpret/question/apply material--that the text is a stimulus or starting place, but teacher-student interaction is the heart of learning. In other words, classroom discourse would routinely display the characteristics of thoughtfulness described by Newmann (1988b).

Teacher-student dialogue would include or be followed by application opportunities built around questions or issues that were not just of interest to the disciplines but involved important, real, and current problems that the students could relate to. These activities would require students to paraphrase, communicate, invent, debate, or otherwise actively process and use the material, and they would include cooperative group projects and structured debates in addition to individualized assignments. Commensurate with student abilities, these assignments would include extended writing opportunities of the "writing to learn" variety.

To the extent that activities were intended to provide opportunities for applying skills or strategies, the teacher would provide direct instruction in and modeling of these skills or strategies (if this had not been provided previously) and would structure the activities to ensure that students understood their purpose and remained purpose-driven when engaging in them. Where relevant, the teacher also would lead the class in post-activity reflection and assessment sessions.

For extended projects, the teacher would not merely outline the project and describe the ultimate product or goal, but would guide the students in planning their work, revising plans, assessing progress intermittently, and so on. Planning guides, decision aids, and related scaffolding techniques would also be used where appropriate, and activities would be designed so that students would not have to spend a great deal of time in repetitive data gathering or other relatively unproductive algorithmic activities. Throughout, both the teacher and the students would retain the recognition that the activities were designed as means to accomplish instructional ends, not as ends in themselves.

I would encourage teachers to include one or more individualized projects with each unit, allowing students as much choice as is feasible and encouraging the more able students to do more. These activities would emphasize getting and synthesizing or responding to information over such activities as coloring, time-consuming construction of mundane artifacts (unless there was some genuine integration with arts objectives), data gathering, or discovery learning.
There might be some ditto and workbook exercises, but fewer of these than is typical and with more emphasis on comprehension or higher level objectives than is typical.

Critical thinking applications would focus mostly on current content (advertising, political speeches, opinion columns, etc.) rather than on hypothetical content or past history (except in history courses or units). There would be assignments calling for students to predict the results of elections, current political crises, stock market movements, and so on (depending on what principles and generalizations were being studied), and to defend their arguments with reference to relevant historical events or discipline-based principles.

To develop citizen action dispositions, there would be at least some emphasis on keeping informed of current news and issues and on getting to know the community (at the secondary grade levels I would extend this to include community service activities, participation in political campaigns, visits to the local council meetings or court proceedings, etc., but I am not sure that these activities would be worth the time or trouble involved for the elementary grades).

Evaluation

In these early grades, I would be at least as much concerned about evaluating the program and the instruction as about evaluating the achievement of individual students. Ideally, evaluation efforts would focus on student achievement of the major objectives, and would be accomplished by asking students to work on tasks calling for holistic demonstration of meaningful understanding of content and ability to apply it using important skills and strategies, rather than more conventional short-answer responses to questions on specific knowledge items or subskills.

Also, the information developed through such evaluation efforts would be used diagnostically rather than just for grading students. That is, the information would be used to assess progress in moving the class as a whole toward major objectives and to identify remediation needs in subgroups and individuals (that would then be followed up with reteaching).

My sense is that tests, interviews, assignments, or other devices for producing the needed evaluation information could be developed relatively straightforwardly to the extent that major instructional objectives were stated clearly and in operational terms (i.e., in terms of what students would have to do in order to demonstrate accurate conceptual understanding and application of what they were learning). The more serious problem would be one of cost-effectiveness: balancing the benefits expected from such unusually thorough evaluation efforts against the costs in instructional time that could have been allocated to new content. Furthermore, to the extent that such evaluation efforts did yield diagnostically useful information, this information would raise other cost-effectiveness dilemmas (e.g., balancing the benefits to be expected from taking extra time to work with low achievers until they fully understood the content against the costs involved in holding back other students who were ready to move on to new content). Thus, even if the technical problems involved in developing efficient and effective evaluation devices were solved relatively easily, thorny policy and value issues surrounding the purposes of evaluation efforts and the intended uses of evaluation data would remain to be resolved.

Conclusions About Higher Order Thinking in Social Studies

In comparing the kinds of higher order thinking discussed in the social studies with the kinds of higher order thinking discussed in other subject matter areas, I see more similarities than differences. This is especially true when the goals of social studies instruction are phrased in terms parallel to those used by Anderson and Roth (in press) to describe the goals of science instruction (e.g., to provide students with knowledge and skills that will enable them to describe, explain, make predictions about, and control their world--in this case, their social world). Such a conceptualization leads to an emphasis on midrange principles and generalizations as the key ideas around which to structure curricula, not only because principles and generalizations are even more powerful than the concepts considered basic to the disciplines but also because they allow one to address the content within a context of application.

The similarities are also made more obvious when attention is drawn to the importance of developing meaningful understanding of the propositional knowledge components of the content and when the skills components are addressed within the context of their roles as parts within holistic inquiry, problem-solving, or decision-making applications of propositional knowledge (rather than as hierarchies of procedural knowledge taught largely independently of propositional knowledge and developed largely through part-skills practice rather than through whole task applications). The problem formulation, data gathering, and critical thinking and reasoning skills involved in formulating and working through social studies problems or decisions appear to be quite similar to those involved in formulating and working through problems in mathematics or science. The need to make personal decisions about the implications of the outcomes of social studies inquiry activities by considering them within the context of one's values adds an extra dimension to social studies decision making that does not exist in ordinary scientific problem solving, but very similar processes are involved in problem formulation, critical thinking about relevant evidence, inductive and deductive reasoning, projection of the probable outcomes of alternative courses of action, and so on.

There appears to be just as much reason to emphasize meaningful understanding as an important intended outcome of instruction in social studies as there is in other subject matter areas, as well as to recognize that this will involve working through networks of related facts, concepts, generalizations, and principles in ways that consider their interactions and address them at a variety of cognitive levels (rather than by considering them mostly in isolation from one another and attempting to proceed linearly from lower level and isolated content toward higher level and more integrated content). Textbooks on teaching social studies usually do not have much to say about this point or its implications for curriculum and instruction, partly because they tend to identify different kinds of intended outcomes (facts, concepts, skills, values) and discuss the teaching of each in isolation without saying much about integrated teaching of content that includes all of these types of intended outcomes. Also, sections dealing with comprehension tend to focus on the teaching of individual concepts rather than on the teaching of networks of content built around key generalizations or principles.

The biggest apparent difference between social studies and other school subjects (most obviously mathematics) is that social studies includes a great deal of propositional knowledge that is not linked in any direct way with particular procedural knowledge. Although everything included in social studies curricula theoretically is included because it is considered important for citizen education purposes and thus is at least potentially useful for personal or civic decision making, much of it may be perceived as static information to be learned for general background purposes rather than as dynamic information to be applied in the process of describing, explaining, making predictions about, or exerting control over one's social experience. This perception can be avoided if social studies instruction is viewed not merely as the transmission of facts and concepts but as development of understanding of how the social world functions, how it came to be the way it is, and what the implications of this may be for personal and civic decision making. If taught this way, social studies learning will not be just rote memorizing but instead will consistently involve critical thinking, reflective thinking, and application to what I have called appreciation and self-actualization goals, and will include frequent opportunities for inquiry, problem solving, values analysis, and decision making. If content selection and development are planned from the beginning within such application contexts, and if supportive rationales and their implications for instruction are made clear to teachers, there is no reason in principle why social studies curricula built around content drawn from the disciplines or built around a multidisciplinary study of topics cannot be consistently dynamic rather than static (this tends not to be a problem with social studies curricula built around discussion of issues and problems).

Instruction in skills (procedural knowledge) would be built into such programs where it would occur naturally as part of the process of applying the propositional knowledge being learned, rather than as separate skills curricula. Some direct instruction on skills would be desirable, especially on the facets or steps involved in higher order applications such as critical thinking, inquiry, problem solving, and decision making. Task analysis information highlighting the subskills involved in any particular application also should be useful to teachers, especially as a basis for diagnosis and remediation when difficulties are encountered. However, overemphasis and misapplication of such task analyses should be avoided (e.g., separation of skills instruction from instruction in other content, proliferation of subskills taught and practiced in isolation, or overemphasis on linear relationships or hierarchies among these subskills). Skills must be kept in perspective as application tools, not ends in themselves.

Skills should be taught within the context of strategic application, which implies attention not only to the cognitive strategies involved but to the elements of metacognitive awareness and conscious self-regulation that should be involved when students learn, remember, organize, or retrieve information, think critically about that information, or apply it during problem solving or decision making activities. Social studies curricula and textbooks on teaching social studies could use more emphasis on metacognition than they typically contain at present, although it will be important to couch such increased emphasis within the context of learning and applying the propositional knowledge being taught, so that such increased emphasis does not result in still more proliferation of thinking skills curricula taught separately from the rest of the content.

The critical thinking and values analysis aspects of social studies teaching provide points of similarity with the teaching of literature and the arts. Critical thinking in each of these subject matter areas has in common the elements of identifying and appreciating the strengths and weaknesses and assessing the overall value or merit of some stimulus. The difference is that critical thinking in social studies focuses on the relevance, truth, and decision-making implications of claims or arguments, whereas critical thinking in literature and the arts focuses on the aesthetic qualities and value of literary and artistic creations.

In addition to these subject matter specific forms of critical thinking, there is another form that appears to apply just as much and with the same meaning in all of the subject matter areas. I refer here to the critical thinking involved in discipline-based discourse that occurs when teachers challenge students to take a position on an issue (e.g., make a prediction, offer an interpretation or explanation, argue in favor of a particular decision or approach to solving a problem) and then defend their position using relevant facts, concepts, generalizations, and principles drawn from the content they have been studying. Sustained critical thinking of this kind appears to be a key feature of the teacher-student dialogue that would occur during the classroom discourse aspects of good subject matter teaching, and follow-up activities and assignments would also be expected to require students to formulate and articulate such critical thinking.

From this perspective, critical thinking may be seen not only as a form of higher order thinking to be developed through subject matter instruction, but as a pervasive feature of the process of instruction itself. With hindsight, we can see that the "new" science and social studies programs of the 1960s erred by identifying the work of scientists too closely with the processes of empirical experimentation, to the point of installing this form of scientific inquiry as the method (not just the goal) of classroom instruction. To the extent that Anderson and Roth (in press) are correct in suggesting that instruction in science (and I would add, social studies) should focus instead on the implications of the content for description, explanation, prediction, and control, it appears that curriculum and instruction in these subjects (and perhaps in all subjects) should focus on engaging the students in critical thinking about the content as a basic and frequently used instructional method.

One form of higher order thinking that appears prominently in discussions of several other subject areas but is not emphasized much in social studies is creative thinking. Perhaps this is because of the term's linkage with the term "creativity," which popularly connotes invention or creation of some physical product. Except when integrated with literature or the arts, social studies does not lend itself well to assignments calling for creation of such products. However, creative thinking is clearly involved in social studies activities such as synthesizing a great deal of information in order to develop and defend a position on an issue, generating potential solutions to problems, or responding to speculative questions. Thus, creative thinking might be included with the other general forms of higher order thinking discussed previously.

I mention this not merely for completeness but to suggest the possibility that conceptualizations of higher order thinking in social studies could be integrated within more general frameworks that have been suggested for conceptualizing higher order thinking across all content areas. Marzano et al. (1988), for example, suggest that critical thinking and creative thinking are intimately linked processes that are involved in all higher order thinking. Michaelis (1988) suggests a similar model in his textbook on teaching social studies. He identifies four general forms of higher order thinking (critical thinking, creative thinking, decision making, and problem solving/inquiry) that each involve use of more specific skills as needed (evaluating, synthesizing, analyzing, predicting, hypothesizing, inferring, generalizing, classifying, comparing, interpreting, remembering).

At this point, it seems clear that proliferation of long lists of skills is not a profitable way to conceptualize higher order thinking in social studies or to frame research on how higher order thinking might be fostered in the classroom. I believe that these goals will be accomplished more profitably using either of two other approaches, although I do not yet feel confident in choosing between them.

One approach is to adopt a framework like that of Michaelis, but to concentrate on the major categories of higher order thinking without getting lost in the longer list of skills. In this regard, I believe that the notion of critical thinking and creative thinking as universal elements in all higher order thinking, and the related notion of decision making and problem solving/inquiry as the purposes to which such higher order thinking is applied, fit not only social studies but all of the subject matter areas.

The second approach would be to adopt a single broad definition of higher order thinking. Newmann has done this by focusing on the processes involved in such thinking: He defines higher order thinking as the thinking that occurs when students are required to organize, manipulate, analyze, evaluate, or interpret information in some new way because a question or problem cannot be solved through routine application of previously learned knowledge. Another approach toward the same goal is to focus on the intended outcomes of instruction. Anderson and Roth have done this by suggesting that science instruction should be designed not only to equip students with knowledge but to provide them with the ability and disposition to use that knowledge for describing, explaining, making predictions about, or controlling their environment. Discussions among researchers at our Center on the notion of empowering students with accessible and usable knowledge as the intended outcomes of instruction represent a similar approach. I believe that one or some combination of these approaches will be suitable for conceptualizing and framing our research, in social studies as well as in the other content areas.

References

Alvermann, D. (1987). Strategic teaching in social studies. In B. Jones, A. Palincsar, D. Ogle, & E. Carr (Eds.), *Strategic teaching and learning: Cognitive instruction in the content areas* (pp. 92-110). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Anderson, C., & Roth, K. (in press). Teaching for meaningful and self-regulated learning of science. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Advances in research on teaching. Vol. 1: Teaching for meaningful understanding and self-regulated learning*. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Anderson, C., & Smith, E. (1987). Teaching science. In V. Richardson-Koehler (Ed.), *Educators' handbook: A research perspective* (pp. 84-111). New York: Longman.

Armbruster, B., & Anderson, T. (1984). Structures of explanations in history textbooks or so what if Governor Stanford missed the spike and hit the rail? *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *16*, 181-194.

Armento, B. (1986). Learning about the economic world. In V. Atwood (Ed.), *Elementary school social studies: Research as guide to practice* (NCSS Bulletin No. 79, pp. 85-101). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Atwood, V. (1986). Elementary social studies: Cornerstone or crumbling mortar? In V. Atwood (Ed.), *Elementary school social studies: Research as guide to practice* (NCSS Bulletin No. 79, pp. 1-13). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Banks, J. (1985). *Teaching strategies for the social studies: Inquiry, valuing and decision-making* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

Barr, R., Barth, J., & Shermis, S. (1977). *Defining the social studies*. Arlington, VA: National Council for the Social Studies.

Bennett, W. (1986). *First lessons: A report on elementary education in America*. Washington: U.S. Department of Education.

Berelson, B. (1963). Introduction. In B. Berelson (Ed.), *The social studies and the social sciences*. New York: Harcourt Brace & World.

Beyer, B. (1985). Critical thinking: What is it? *Social Education*, *49*, 270-276.

Bragaw, D., & Hartoonian, H.M. (1988). Social studies: The study of people in society. In R. Brandt (Ed.), *Content of the curriculum* (pp. 9-29). Reston, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Brophy, J. (1987). On motivating students. In D. Berliner & B. Rosenshine (Eds.), *Talks to teachers* (pp. 201-245). New York: Random House.

Brubaker, D., Simon, L., & Williams, J. (1977). A conceptual framework for social studies curriculum and instruction. *Social Education*, *41*, 201-203.

California State Department of Education. (1987). History-social science framework. Sacramento: Author.

Cassidy, E., & Kurfman, D. (1977). Decision making as purpose and process. In D. Kurfman (Ed.), Developing decision-making skills (pp. 1-26). Arlington, VA: National Council for the Social Studies.

Cherryholmes, C. (1980). Social knowledge and citizenship education: Two views of truth and criticism. Curriculum Inquiry, 10, 115-141.

Cornbleth, C. (1985). Critical thinking and cognitive processes. In W. B. Stanley (Ed.), Review of research in social studies education: 1976-1983. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Crabtree, C. (1983). A common curriculum in the social studies. In G. Fenstermacher & J. Goodlad (Eds.), Individual differences and the common curriculum (82nd yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I, pp. 248-281). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Devine, T. (1981). Teaching study skills: A guide for teachers. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Egan, K. (1979). Educational development. New York: Oxford University Press.

Egan, K. (1982). Teaching history to young children. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 439-441.

Elkind, D. (1981). Child development and the social science curriculum of the elementary school. Social Education, 45, 435-437.

Engle, S. (1960). Decision making: The heart of social studies instruction. Social Education, 24, 301-304.

Engle, S., & Longstreet, W. (1972). A design for social education in the open curriculum. New York: Harper & Row.

Engle, S., & Ochoa, A. (1988). Education for democratic citizenship: Decision making in the social studies. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fair, J. (1977). Skills in thinking. In D. Kurfman (Ed.), Developing decision-making skills (47th NCSS Yearbook, pp. 29-68). Arlington, VA: National Council for the Social Studies.

Feely, T. (1983). Critical thinking: Toward a definition, paradigm, and research agenda. Theory and Research in Social Education, 11, 1-19.

Finn, C.E., & Ravitch, D. (1988). No trivial pursuit. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 559-564.

Fraenkel, J. (1980). Helping students think and value: Strategies for teaching the social studies (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Glaser, R. (1984). Education and thinking: The role of knowledge. American Psychologist, 39, 93-104.

Good, T., & Brophy, J. (1987). *Looking in classrooms* (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Haas, J. (1979). Social studies: Where have we been? Where are we going? *Social Studies*, *70*, 147-154.

Hanna, P. (1963). Revising the social studies: What is needed? *Social Education*, *27*, 190-196.

Harshman, R., & Gray, C. (1983). A rationale for value education. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *11*, 45-66.

Herman, W. (1983). What should be taught where? *Social Education*, *47*, 94-100.

Hertzberg, H. (1981). *Social studies reform: 1880-1980*. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium.

Hoge, J., & Crump, C. (1988). *Teaching history in the elementary school*. Bloomington: Indiana University, Social Studies Development Center.

Joyce, W., & Alleman-Brooks, J. (1982). The child's world. *Social Education*, *46*, 538-541.

Kaltsounis, T. (1987). *Teaching social studies in the elementary school: The basics for citizenship* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kliebard, H. (1987). *The struggle for the American curriculum 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge & Kegan-Paul.

Kohlberg, L. (1975). Moral education for a society in moral transition. *Educational Leadership*, *33*, 46-54.

Kurfman, D. (1982). Evaluation in social studies. In Project Span Staff and Consultants (Ed.), *Working papers from Project Span* (pp. 3-27). Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium.

Lengel, J., & Superka, D. (1982). Curriculum organization in social studies. In *The Current State of Social Studies: A report of Project SPAN*. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium.

Levstik, L. (1986). Teaching history: A definitional and developmental dilemma. In V. Atwood (Ed.), *Elementary school social studies: Research as guide to practice* (NCSS Bulletin No. 79, pp. 68-84). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Marshall, K. (1985). Social studies curriculum revision, K-8: The Boston experience. *Social Education*, *49*, 314-317.

Martorella, P. (1985). *Elementary social studies: Developing reflective, competent, and concerned citizens*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.

Marzano, R., Brandt, R., Hughes, C., Jones, B., Presseisen, B., Rankin, S., & Suhor, C. (1988). Dimensions of thinking: A framework for curriculum and instruction. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McKenzie, G. (1986). Learning and instruction. In V. Atwood (Ed.), Elementary school social studies: Research as guide to practice (NCSS Bulletin No. 79, pp. 119-136). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Mehlinger, H., & Davis, O. (Eds.). (1981). The social studies (80th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Michaelis, J. (1976). Social studies for children in a democracy: Recent trends and developments (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Michaelis, J. (1988). Social studies for children: A guide to basic instruction (9th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Michigan State Board of Education. (1987). Essential goals and objectives for social studies education in Michigan (K-12). Lansing: Author.

National Council for the Social Studies. (1979). Revision of the NCSS social studies curriculum guidelines. Social Education, 43, 261-278.

National Council for the Social Studies. (1981). Statement on essentials of the social studies. Social Education, 45, 162-164.

Naylor, D., & Diem, R. (1987). Elementary and middle school social studies. New York: Random House.

Newmann, F. (1988a). The assessment of discourse in social studies. Madison: University of Wisconsin, National Center on Effective Secondary Schools.

Newmann, F. (Ed.). (1988b). Higher order thinking in high school social studies: An analysis of classrooms, teachers, students, and leadership. Madison: University of Wisconsin, National Center on Effective Secondary Schools.

Newmann, F. (in press). Higher order thinking in the teaching of social studies: Connections between theory and practice. In D. Perkins, J. Segal, & J. Voss (Eds.), Informal reasoning and education. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ochoa, A.S., & Shuster, S.K. (1980). Social studies in the classroom, K-6. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium.

Oliver, D., & Shaver, J. (1966). Teaching public issues in the high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Parker, W., & Jarolimek, J. (1984). Citizenship and the critical role of the social studies (NCSS Bulletin 72). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Parker, W., & Kaltsounis, T. (1986). Citizenship and law-related education. In V. Atwood (Ed.), *Elementary school social studies: Research as guide to practice* (NCSS Bulletin No. 79, pp. 14-33). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Popenfus, J., & Paradise, L. (1978). Social studies objectives in theory and practice. *The Social Studies*, *69*, 200-203.

Prawat, R. (1988). *Promoting access: The role of organization and awareness factors*. (Elementary Subject Center Series No. 1). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects.

Raskin, M., & Bernstein, H. (1987). *New ways of knowing: The sciences, society, and reconstructive knowledge*. Totowa, NJ: Roman & Littlefield.

Raths, L., Harmin, M., & Simon, S. (1978). *Values and teaching* (2nd ed.). Columbus: Merrill.

Ravitch, D. (1987). Tot sociology or what happened to history in the grade schools. *American Scholar*, *56*, 343-353.

Shaver, J. (1981). Citizenship, values, and morality in the social studies. In H. Mehlinger & O. Davis (Eds.), *The social studies* (80th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, pp. 105-125). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shaver, J. (1987). What should be taught in social studies? In V. Richardson-Koehler (Ed.), *Educators' handbook: A research perspective* (pp. 112-138). New York: Longman.

Solomon, W. (1987). Improving students' thinking skills through elementary social studies instruction. *Elementary School Journal*, *87*, 557-569.

Stodolsky, S. (1988). *The subject matters: Classroom activity in math and social studies*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Taba, H., Durkin, M., Fraenkel, J., & McNaughton, A. (1971). *A teacher's handbook to elementary social studies* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Thornton, S. (in press). Teacher as curricular gatekeeper in social studies. In J. Shaver (Ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning*. New York: Macmillan.

Thornton, S., & Wenger, R.N. (1988, November). *Geographic education in the elementary school: Current practices and the projects for reform*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Orlando.